This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE BIBLE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

[illegible]

THE BIBLE

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

EIGHT LECTURES

BY

J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A.

LECTURER ON THE HISTORY OF RELIGION
MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY
1903

[illegible]

PRINTED BY ELSOM AND CO.
MARKET-PLACE, HULL.

TO

A. M. C.

WITH WHOSE ENCOURAGEMENT

THESE LECTURES

WERE FIRST DELIVERED

AND AFTERWARDS

MADE INTO THIS BOOK

PREFATORY NOTE.

This book originated in a course of lectures delivered in various towns in England, Scotland, and Wales, during the years 1900—1903. Their object was to awaken the interest of Christians of all Churches in the modern study of the sacred books of their religion, by sketching the history of the processes of investigation, and indicating some of the results which have been so far attained.

In preparing the lectures for the press, it was possible to expand the treatment of some topics which were handled with inevitable brevity in oral exposition; but their sequence has not been altered, and the author has endeavoured throughout to write with the memory of his audiences still before him. Questions of theology have been kept in the background, except in the last lecture, where it appeared desirable to consider some modern forms of the doctrine of authority both in the Bible and the Church.

The Author desires to express his sincere thanks to the Delegates of the University Press, Oxford, for their kindness in permitting him to employ the Revised Version in the lectures on the Gospels; and to the two friends who have so generously aided him with suggestions and corrections in the reading of the proofs.

OXFORD, *March 20th*, 1903.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF INQUIRY

		PAGE
	Changes in our conceptions of religion during the Nineteenth Century	1
i.	The Bible in the Eighteenth Century	4
	Different attitudes of Apologists...	5
	Locke's declaration	7
	Protests of Cambridge divines	8
	Labours on the text: (*a*) the New Testament	11
	(*b*) the Old Testament	12
	Marsh's *Dissertation on the First Three Gospels*	14
ii.	Difficulties of Biblical Study in England	15
	Thirlwall translates Schleiermacher's *Essay on the Gospel of Luke* ...	15
	Early views of Pusey on German theology	17
	Milman's *History of the Jews*	19
	Coleridge and the appeal to religious experience	20
	The *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*	21
	Dr. Arnold and historical criticism	22
iii.	Movements of thought at Oxford	24
	Plans of Stanley and Jowett	25
	Edition of the Epistles of St. Paul	26
	Essays and Reviews	28
	Proceedings against Dr. Rowland Williams and Rev. H. B. Wilson	31
	Dr. Colenso on the Pentateuch	33
	Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council	37
	Proposals for relaxation in the terms of Subscription...	40
	And for the abolition of University tests	41

LECTURE II.

THE REVISED VERSION

		PAGE
	Growing demand for a Revision of the Authorised Version	44
i.	Defects in the received Translation	45
	Unsatisfactory character of the received Text of the New Testament	47
	Materials available for the construction of a text: analogy of the early Buddhist Scriptures	48
ii.	Movements for Revision in the Seventeenth Century...	51
	Labours of Walton and Mill	52
	The Old Testament in the Eighteenth Century	54
	Lowth and Geddes on causes of error and means of correction ...	56
	Obscurity of the history of the Hebrew Text	58
iii.	Mill and Bentley on the New Testament	60
	English use of Wetstein's edition	62
	Archbishop Newcome's rendering	63
	The *Improved Version*	63
	Progress of Textual Criticism: (*a*) Lachmann (*b*) Tischendorf ...	65
	Proposals for Revision in England: various translations	68
	English labour on the Text	69
	Plea for a Royal Commission, 1856	71
iv.	Movement in 1870: Mr. Buxton and the Bishop of Winchester ...	73
	Committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury	77
v.	The Correction of the Translation of the New Testament	78
	The Reconstruction of the Text...	82
	Views of Dr. Hort on its early history	83
vi.	Results of Revision	87
	External aspects of the new Version	89
	Treatment of the Text of the Old Testament	91
	Different issue in the New Testament	93
	Illustrations of amended renderings	95

LECTURE III.

CHANGED VIEWS OF THE LAW

	Twofold object of critical enquiry, (1) literary, (2) historical ...	98
i.	Theories of the Relation of the Old Testament to the New... ...	99
	Parallels and allegories	100
	'Type' and 'Antitype'	103
	Typology of the Levitical ritual	106
ii.	Basis of Typology in the tradition of Mosaic authorship	109
	Early hints of post-Mosaic elements	110

		PAGE
	Astruc's *Conjectures*, 1753	111
	'The Higher Criticism' defined, 1787...	112
	The Key to the composition of the Pentateuch, *Exod.* 6^{2-8}	114
	(1) The Priestly Code, **P**	115
	(2) The document using the name Yahweh (Jehovah), **J**	116
	(3) The document using the name Elohim up to *Exod.* 3^{15}, **E** ...	117
	(4) The Book of *Deuteronomy*, **D**	119
iii.	Two-fold question: (1) In what order were these composed? (2) Can the date of any of them be fixed? ...	120
	De Wette (1806) identifies *Deuteronomy* with the Law promulgated under Josiah, 621 B.C.	121
	Ewald's arrangement of the documentary order, **P, JE, D**	123
	English work in the middle of the century: F. W. Newman ...	125
	Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*	127
	Colenso on the Pentateuch	128
iv.	The Modern order, **JE, D, P**	130
	Origins of **J** and **E**	130
	Relation of **P** to **D**: Reuss, Vatke, George, Kuenen, and Graf ...	133
	Kalisch: Wellhausen: W. R. Smith	135
	Development of Levitical legislation after **D**	136
	Publication under Ezra and Nehemiah, 444 B.C.	138
v.	Resolution of the Pentateuchal Law into successive codes	140
	Ascription to a divine origin: parallels	141
	Disappearance of typology under the historical method	143
vi.	Relation of the Law to Israel's religious development	145
	Prophetic principles in the First Code...	147
	Deuteronomy and the struggle with foreign usages	148
	New religious demands after the exile	151
	The Law adapts the truths of the higher Prophecy to the national life	153

LECTURE IV.

CHANGED VIEWS OF PROPHECY

	The second canon, viz., the Prophets	155
i.	The Prophets according to the arrangement of the Synagogue ...	155
	Different views of their significance	158
ii.	Prophecy and Prediction	159
	Applications of prophecy in the New Testament	160
iii.	Growth of historical criticism	163
	The Book of *Isaiah*; its varied elements	163
	(*a*) The argument from history	166
	(*b*) The argument from diversity of theme	167
	(*c*) The argument from style	168

		PAGE
iv.	The Book of *Daniel*	171
	Dr. Pusey and 'unbelieving critics'	172
	(*a*) The evidence from language	174
	(*b*) The evidence from prediction	175
	(*c*) Cuneiform testimony	176
	General results of the historical study of prophecy	178
v.	Prophetic activity among other nations	181
	Origins of Hebrew prophecy	182
	Its early forms and influence	184
	Prophecy in the Eighth Century B.C.	186
	Kuenen sums it up in 'Ethical Monotheism'...	191
vi.	Reaction on the national traditions	191
	Religious strength imparted by prophecy: 722 and 586 B.C. ...	192
	Contrast with Greek prophecy...	194
	Epimenides at Athens, after 632 B.C.	197
	Legislation of Solon	198
	Jeremiah and the 'new covenant'	199
	The theodicy of Ezekiel...	202
	Prophets and Psalmists	203
vii.	Parallels to 'Ethical Monotheism'	205
	Prophetic view of the Unity of History	208
	Conception of a divine purpose in Israel	211
	Contrasts in post-Captivity prophecy	213
	Ideal of religious union among the great world-powers	214

LECTURE V.

THE GOSPELS AND THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

	The New Testament in literary contrast with the Old	217
	Difficulties in the study of the Gospels	218
i.	Resemblances and divergences in the First Three	219
	The history of the Gospels must be gathered by criticism	220
	Treatment in the Eighteenth Century: Woolston and Paley ...	221
	Reimarus and the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*	222
	Lessing on the *Evangelists as Human Historians*	223
	Griesbach's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels	224
	(1) Theory that later Evangelists used their predecessors (Townson)	225
	(2) Theory of dependence on tradition (Eckermann and Gieseler)...	227
	Modern expositions by Westcott and Wright	229
	(3) Theory of employment of a common original (Eichhorn) ...	230
	Marsh's scheme of mutual relation	231
	Herder's arrangement (1797)	233

		PAGE
	Schleiermacher modifies Eichhorn's hypothesis	234
	Wilke and Weisse maintain the priority of *Mark*	235
ii.	Twofold problem in the Gospels, (1) literary, (2) historical ...	236
	Baur and Strauss	238
	Difficulties in Germany concerning the miraculous	239
	Rationalist methods of Paulus and others	240
	Strauss and the Myth, *Leben Jesu* (1835)	243
	The narrative of the Temptation	245
	Destructive character of his criticism	247
	Need of a new method of investigation of sources	251
iii.	Baur on Gnosticism and the Pastoral Epistles (1835)	252
	New Testament documents and second-century history	255
	The labours of Paul	256
	The struggle of the Gentile party with the Judaisers	258
	Baur and *Tendenz*: the Gospels and the Church	260
	Matthew	261
	Luke	263
	Mark	265
	John	267
iv.	Need of explaining the origin of the Church	271
	The Lives of Jesus: Ewald (1855)	272
	Renan's *Vie de Jesus* (1863)	274
	Strauss's *New Life of Jesus* (1864)	277
	Keim's *Jesus of Nazara* (1867-72)	281
v.	Theology in England	282
	Hennell's *Inquiry* (1838)	283
	Subsequent influences	286
	Ecce Homo (1866)	288

LECTURE VI.

THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS

PART I. THE LITERARY INVESTIGATION

	General significance of the Tübingen criticism	293
	Clearer view of (1) literary relations and (2) historic values ...	295
i.	Tübingen views in England	295
	Supernatural Religion	297
	Essays of Lightfoot	299
ii.	Movement in favour of the priority of Mark	299
	Schenkel's *Characterbild Jesu* (1863)	300
	Holtzmann on the Synoptic Gospels (1863)	301
	Weizsäcker's *Untersuchungen* (1864 and 1901)	301
	The 'Two-document Hypothesis'	302

PAGE

iii. Testimonies of Papias concerning Mark and Matthew 303
Did Papias know our Gospels 304
Mark compared with the other two 306
Resemblances of language 307
Resemblances of order 310
Secondary modifications in *Matthew* 312
Matthew and *Luke* 314
The message of the Baptist 316
The preaching of the Baptist 318
Blessings of *Matt.* 5; Blessings and Woes of *Luke* 6 320
Analogies in the literature of the modern Bábís 323
Conjectural history of the Synoptics 328
Formation of traditions before 70 A.D. 329
Matthew's *Logia* and Mark's notes of Peter's recollections 330
The expanded *Mark* 331
Origin of *Luke* 332
Did Luke use *Matthew?* 334
Literary arrangement of *Matthew* 335
Signs of later origin, and of additions 336
Limits of dates 338
Table of modern views 340

PART II. THE HISTORIC INVESTIGATION

Christianity and the principle of Evolution 341
i. Study of the physical, social, and religious 'environment' 342
The differences of the Gospels still need explanation 344
Modifications of the Tübingen view
(*a*) Discoveries of new literature 345
(*b*) Different estimates of church parties 346
(*c*) Other influences from Hellenism 347
ii. Different preconceptions in approaching the Gospels 349
Recognition of degrees of value in Gospel evidence 352
Matt. $27^{52\text{-}53}$ 353
Matt. $28^{16\text{-}20}$ 354
The withering of the fig-tree 355
Parallel growth of the miraculous in Buddhism 358
And similarly in modern Babism 361
Transfiguration of the Báb 362
Messiah's war with the evil spirits 364
iii. Place of the Messianic idea in the Gospel narratives 369
The expectation of the return of Jesus 371
The 'coming of the Son of Man' 373
Did Jesus claim to be Messiah? 377
Changed significance of the question for religion 379
Permanent elements in the teaching of Jesus 381

LECTURE I.

THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF INQUIRY

THE Nineteenth Century has witnessed a vast change in our conceptions of religion. New modes of thought have arisen; fresh intellectual impulses have been imparted in widely sundered fields of study; and immense accumulations of knowledge have rewarded the enquirer into the history of man and the constitution of the universe. The older Evangelicalism and the older Rationalism which ineffectually confronted each other a hundred years ago, have both been profoundly modified. Within the Church of England the Oxford movement produced a powerful ecclesiastical revival, the effects of which are everywhere visible to-day. The onward march of science was at first embarrassed by the resistance of the theologians over the early chapters of the book of Genesis. At a later stage behind the questions of the Creation and the Flood arose the profounder difficulties concerning the origin of the human race, its antiquity, its primitive condition, and its subsequent development; and finally the

hypothesis of Evolution extended its sway over the whole phenomena of human life, and offered an explanation of the growth of man's thought, his social institutions, his arts, morals, and faith. Long before this was attempted, philosophy—for the time impersonated in Coleridge—sought to discover the foundations of religion in the reason and conscience, and the higher affections for truth, beauty, and goodness; and the inevitable application of ethical judgments to the sphere of theology destroyed one after another of the prevailing interpretations of Christian dogma. The great foreign missions, and the British conquest of India, had already brought to light the existence of collections of sacred books in China and Hindostan rivalling the Bible in antiquity, serving as the ground of religious knowledge and the rule of life for hundreds of millions of people, and containing teaching not unworthy to be set beside that attributed to Moses or Jesus. The spirit of historical enquiry, once awakened, enlisted a whole army of scholars in its service. Discoveries in Egypt and Mesopotamia supplied the clues to lost languages and buried civilisations; and a new science of the comparative study of religion was established.

The Bible could not remain unaffected by all this manifold activity. What influence has been exerted by the advance of knowledge on our view of the Scriptures? The whole process may be summed up in the treatment of the records of our religion by what the English Priestley designated in

1782 as 'the historical method,'[1] or what the German theologian Eichhorn described as early as 1787 as 'the higher criticism.'[2]

It is the object of the present course of lectures to sketch the conditions under which this has been effected, and exhibit some of its results. These have not been attained without difficulty. Powerful forces of tradition were arrayed against too bold enquirers. The influence of ecclesiastical corporations, large and small, established and non-established, was invoked to suppress undue liberty and avert danger to the faith. It seems fitting, therefore, to recite very briefly at the outset the history of what may be called the struggle for freedom of Biblical research. The chief arena of this contest was the Church of England, though the same controversy arose outside as well as within its fold: and the decisions of the Anglican tribunals, together with the general progress of thought, have been the main instruments in securing for Biblical study in this country its legitimate place. In this respect, the contrast between the laxity of the eighteenth century and the stringency of the first half of the nineteenth is not without instruction.

[1] Preface to the *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. He thus states his purpose, 'to shew what circumstances in the state of things, and especially of other prevailing opinions and prejudices, made the alteration, in doctrine or practice, sufficiently natural, and the introduction and establishment of it easy. And if I have succeeded in this investigation, this historical method will be found to be one of the most satisfactory modes of argumentation,' etc.

[2] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, preface.

I.

The eighteenth century has been described as 'an age whose poetry was without romance, whose philosophy was without insight, and whose public men were without character.'[1] It is not surprising, then, that its theology should appear sterile. Yet it began with Locke's endeavour to prove Christianity reasonable and to make St. Paul intelligible; it produced the Evangelical revival with its impassioned faith and its eager philanthropies; and, as it ran out, a new note of religion was sounded in Wordsworth's 'Lines on Tintern Abbey.'[2] In the first half, however, the great Deistical controversy practically absorbed all thought.[3] The chief problem was the relation of what was known as 'Revelation' to reason; and discussion raged round difficulties arising from discrepancies in the Biblical records, the character of the early narratives in Genesis, the morality of the injunctions for the massacre of the Canaanites, or the claims of prophecy and miracle. 'Christianity,' in the pungent words of Mr. Pattison, 'appeared made for nothing else but to be "proved"; what use to make of it when it was proved was not much thought about.'

[1] Mark Pattison, in *Essays and Reviews*, 3rd ed. 1860, p. 254.

[2] In the *Lyrical Ballads*, 1798.

[3] A brief but admirable account of its significance will be found in the *Retrospect of the Religious Life of England*, by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, chap. v. section ix. On its import for philosophy the student will of course consult the *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* by Sir Leslie Stephen

The apologists, however, took up very different positions with respect to the Scriptures. Sometimes, as in Butler's famous *Analogy* (1736), the questions of inspiration and authority were thrown into the background; the gospels, for example, were accepted as adequate statements of historic fact, supported by the testimony of St. Paul, and by the belief of the first converts who had ample opportunity of informing themselves of the truth. Warburton lavished prodigious learning on his demonstration of *the Divine Legation of Moses* 'on the Principles of a Religious Deist from the Omission of the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments in the Jewish Dispensation' (1737-41). But he found it sufficient to assume the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in a single sentence without proof.[1] Sherlock, who in 1728 was consecrated Bishop of Bangor, thought it not undignified to argue the case for the resurrection of Jesus in the form of a mock trial.[2] The alternative to the literal reality of the Gospel narratives is a fraudulent plot; and the evidence of the apostles is guaranteed both by their own miraculous powers and their readiness to die on behalf of the truth. Addison's *Essay on the Evidences of Christianity*[3] only proved how imperfect

[1] 'The history of Moses may be divided into two periods; from the creation to his mission, and from his mission to his delivering up his command to Joshua; the first written by him in quality of historian, the second of legislator.' Book V, § 5, II. i.

[2] *The Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*, published anonymously in 1729.

[3] Published in 1721; he had died in 1719.

was the equipment of an accomplished Oxford scholar for dealing with a complicated historical problem.[1] Very different was the method of the learned Nonconformist, Nathaniel Lardner (1684-1768). Educated among the Independents and Presbyterians, he had studied also at Utrecht and Leyden. He spent thirty years over his great work on the *Credibility of the Gospel History* (1727-57), in which his effort to prove that the facts of the New Testament are narrated without real discrepancies was supplemented by his immense collection of testimonies to the date and authorship of the several books.[2] Here, as in the *Analogy*, no theory of inspiration is formulated. Lardner's aim is to vindicate the Evangelists and sustain the miracles; but he does so without making embarrassing claims. The mass of his learning has secured him a firm place in the ranks of conservative theologians; it is all the more remarkable that in his treatment of demoniacal possession he should have inclined to rationalism.[3]

[1] Macaulay's description is well known (*Essays*, vol. iii. p. 434). 'He assigns as grounds for his religious belief, stories as absurd as that of the Cock-lane ghost, and forgeries as rank as Ireland's Vortigern, puts faith in the lie about the Thundering Legion, is convinced that Tiberius moved the senate to admit Jesus among the gods, and pronounces the letter of Abgarus king of Edessa to be a record of great authority.'

[2] 'He may justly be regarded as the founder of the modern school of critical research in the field of early Christian Literature' (Rev. Alex. Gordon in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*)

[3] See four discourses on the Gadarene Demoniac, *Works* (ed. 1788) vol. i. His answer to the objection that 'our blessed Lord, if he did not countenance the common and prevailing opinion upon this head, does not appear to have opposed or discouraged it,' will be found at p. 483.

The popular view of the divine authority of the Scriptures rested on the common term 'Word of God' as applied to the Bible. In the eighteenth century under the commanding voice of Locke—'It has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter'—the infallibility of the Bible was generally received;[1] though it was reserved for an Oxford theologian in the nineteenth century to give to that doctrine its most explicit statement in the university pulpit in the controversy which followed the publication of *Essays and Reviews*.

'The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, (where are we to stop?) every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.'[2]

There were not wanting, however, protests against the view implied in Locke's language about 'dictation' by the Holy Spirit;[3] and a series of distinguished divines at Cambridge did much to prepare the way for the theological movement of a later day. They were nurtured on Locke's *Reasonableness of Christianity* and the *Paraphrase of the Epistles*, which

[1] 'The doctrine of unerring literal inspiration was almost everywhere held in its strictest form' (Abbey & Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 560). Locke, letter to Rev. R. King, Aug. 25th, 1703, *Works* (ed. 1801), vol. x., p. 304.

[2] Burgon, *Inspiration and Interpretation*, 1861, p. 89.

[3] 'The spirit of God that dictated these sacred writings' (preface to the *Paraphrase of the Epistles of St. Paul, etc.*)

were the main text books of divinity in the university, and they used to the full the liberty of interpretation which Locke had so strenuously justified. Conyers Middleton (1683-1750), the 'Principal Librarian of the University of Cambridge,' who had rebuked Waterland for his method of controversy with Tindal, and then in turn asserted against his antagonist that 'should we allow Christianity to be a meer Imposture,' an attempt to overturn it must be criminal and immoral,[1]—protested against the theory that the Biblical writers were but 'mere organs or pipes through which God thought fit to convey the knowledge of certain extraordinary facts and divine truths to the world.'[2] So far from being of service to Christianity, he argued, this doctrine 'always has been, and ever will be, a clog and incumbrance to it, with all rational and thinking men;'[3] and he laid down the same method for theological study as for the field of nature—'it is experience alone, and the observation of facts, which can illustrate the truth of principles.'[4] The controversial boldness of Middleton doubtless hindered his preferment: but his assault on the historical character of the narrative of the Fall involved him in no ecclesiastical penalties. Another Cambridge divine, Edmund Law (1703-87), anticipated the well-known maxim of an Oxford essayist a century later about interpreting the New Testament like any other book. In 1745 he pub-

[1] *Works*, vol. ii. 1752, p. 168.

[2] 'On the Variations found in the Four Evangelists,' *ibid.* p. 51.

[3] 'On the Dispute between the Apostles Peter and Paul,' *ibid.* p. 19. [4] *Ibid.* p. 74.

lished *Considerations on the State of the World with regard to the Theory of Religion*, which ran through many editions, and did not prevent him from becoming Master of Peterhouse in 1756, and afterwards Bishop of Carlisle (1768). Like the discourse of another Oxford essayist, it was founded on the idea of a divine education of the human race in religion as in other departments of knowledge. The arguments were not always philologically sound, as when he suggested that the Brahmans of India were really *Abrahamans* or sons of Abraham.[1] But the conclusion was just; the Scriptures must be examined 'with the same freedom that we do, and find we must do, every other book which we desire to understand';[2] and with this conclusion 'the notion of an *absolute* immediate *inspiration* of each part and period' fell away. To the patronage of Bishop Law, Paley (1743-1805) owed his promotion to the Archdeaconry of Carlisle; and his treatment of the New Testament in his *Evidences of Christianity* (1794) was conceived in the spirit of his episcopal supporter. The comparison (Part III. chap. i.) of discrepancies in the statements about the crucifixion with the diversities between the narratives of Clarendon and Burnet about the condemnation and execution of the Marquis of Argyll in the reign of Charles II., at once took the gospels out of the sphere of divine 'dictation.' If Matthew applied ancient

[1] 6th edition, 1774, p. 71.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 264. He protests against 'insisting on such universal absolute infallibility as never can be made out to those who are not already persuaded of it.'

prophecies to situations which did not fit their original meaning, why 'such accommodations of passages of old authors, from books especially which are in every one's hands, are common with writers of all countries.' Neither critical mistakes, even if they were clearly made out, nor a wrong estimate of the approach of the day of judgment, nor a mistaken explanation of the phenomena of disease, need shake the credibility of the Evangelists' testimony to the acts and words of their Master; and if St. Paul reasoned like a rabbi, it is lawful to distinguish between doctrines and proofs; 'the doctrine itself must be received, but it is not necessary in order to defend Christianity to defend the propriety of every comparison or the validity of every argument which the apostle has brought into the discussion.' Two years after the publication of Paley's evidences, Bishop Watson issued *An Apology for the Bible, in a series of Letters addressed to Thomas Paine*, 1796. The episcopal decorum is grievously shocked by the rough brutality of Paine's arguments, and it cannot be said that he always succeeds in parrying them.[1] But he is not anxious to enforce the highest

[1] Neither writer apparently was acquainted with the history (for instance) of the critical study of the Pentateuch. But Paine could make discoveries for himself, and he hit on the mention of Dan in *Gen.* xiv. 14 as an indication of a date later than the migration and settlement described in *Judges* xviii. The argument was already of respectable antiquity, though to him it was new. His antagonist, after making the natural suggestion that the name might be ascribed to the later hand of an editor, ventured on a fresh refutation as follows, 9th ed., 1806, p. 206: 'I desire further to have it proved that the Dan mentioned in Genesis was the name of a town and not of a river. It is merely said that Abraham pursued them, the enemies of Lot, to Dan. Now a river was full as likely as a town to stop a pursuit. *Lot*, we know, was

view of Biblical infallibility. 'Give but the authors of the Bible that credit,' he pleads (p. 229), 'which you give to other historians; believe them to deliver the word of God when they tell you that they do so; believe, when they relate other things as of themselves, and not the Lord, that they wrote to the best of their knowledge and capacity; and you will be in your belief something very different from a deist; you may not be allowed to aspire to the character of an orthodox believer, but you will not be an unbeliever in the divine authority of the Bible; though you should admit human mistakes and human opinions to exist in some parts of it.'[1] It is to be regretted that the author felt compelled to justify the massacre of the Canaanites by the example of nature which occasionally engulfs a city in an earthquake.

Meanwhile other influences were slowly at work. The Greek text of the New Testament had long been the subject of devoted study by John Mill (1645-1707), who became Principal of St. Edmund Hall in 1685. With great labour he examined many valuable MSS. in this country, and procured important collations from the Continent. But in preparing

settled in the plain of *Jordan*; and Jordan, we know, was composed of the united streams of two rivers, called *Jor* and *Dan*'! The older commentators traced *Dan* to a fountain called Phiala, among the roots of Lebanon; *Jor* was supposed to join it at Caesarea Philippi. See Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. i. (1863), p. 1129.

[1] Compare the course recommended to 'a sincere enquirer' (p. 261): 'he would consider that the Bible being, as to many of its parts, an old book, and written by various authors, and at different and distant periods, there might probably, occur some difficulties and apparent contradictions in the historical part of it; he would endeavour to remove these difficulties, to reconcile these apparent contradictions, by the rules of such sound criticism as he would use in examining the contents of any other book,' etc.

a new edition, he did not attempt to construct a fresh text. He was content to reproduce the text of Stephens from the edition of 1550 without change, adding the enormous mass of various readings (it is said that they exceeded 30,000) at the bottom of each page, for the reader to deal with them as he could. His death a fortnight after the appearance of his great work relieved him from the acrimony of critics who feared lest the authority of the sacred text should be endangered; but his cause was splendidly defended by Bentley, in whose person Cambridge scholarship prepared to pursue the task a stage further. As early as 1716 Bentley designed to produce an edition of the text, with the help of the oldest Greek and Latin MSS., 'exactly as it was in the best examples at the time of the Council of Nice, so that there shall not be twenty words nor even particles difference; and this shall carry its own demonstration in every verse.'[1] But the plan never got further than the publication of systematic proposals and a specimen in 1720;[2] more than a hundred years were to pass before the time was ripe for such an enterprise.

The turn of the Old Testament came next, in the middle of the century, when the year 1753 witnessed the publication of two important works by Oxford scholars, Kennicott's *First Dissertation on the State of the Hebrew Text,* and Lowth's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry.[3] Kennicott (1718-83) was a

[1] Letter to Archbishop Wake, *Works*, ed. Dyce, 1838, vol. iii., p. 477.
[2] *Works*, vol. iii., p. 487. [3] *De Sacra Poësi Hebræorum Prælectiones.*

Fellow of Exeter, and Lowth (1710-87) had been Professor of Poetry in the university. Kennicott's second dissertation in 1759[1] resulted in a subscription of nearly £10,000 for the collation of Hebrew MSS. throughout Europe, the results of which were embodied in his great Hebrew Bible (1776-80).[2] Lowth's scholarship was of a finer type. He could not, indeed, reach the point of view of the great German critic and philosopher, Herder; he dealt with the form instead of the ideas of Hebrew poetry; and he believed that Hebrew was the language of Paradise. But he gave an important impulse to Old Testament study. He planned a new translation of the prophetic books, and himself issued a volume on Isaiah, with an important preliminary dissertation and ample notes;[3] and like Archbishop Secker he made some valuable corrections both of the Hebrew text and of the Authorised Version somewhat in the fashion of the classical scholarship of his day. From this country the work of Mill, Bentley, and Lowth became known in Germany. Through Bengel and Wetstein New Testament study was carried on to the days of Griesbach;[4] and Lowth's lectures were translated and annotated by the great orientalist, J. D. Michaelis of Göttingen.

[1] Written after Secker, then Bishop of Oxford, had urged him to undertake a regular collation of MSS.

[2] The familiar censure soon appeared at Oxford: such efforts, it was alleged, led men to value the letter rather than the spirit of the Bible.

[3] In 1778; he had been translated from the see of Oxford to that of London in 1777.

[4] For an account of proposals for a new version of the Scriptures, and further detail concerning critical labour on the text, see Lect. II.

Thither in 1785 went a young Cambridge scholar, Herbert Marsh (1757-1839), who repaid some of the debt which he owed to Michaelis by publishing in 1793 a translation of the first volume of his teacher's *Introduction to the New Testament*, with notes and dissertations. Other volumes followed; and the last, published in 1801, contained a striking dissertation on the origin and composition of the first three Gospels from Marsh's own pen. Every intelligent reader of the Gospels now knows how complicated are the facts, both of resemblance and difference, which require explanation. Marsh's conception of the processes by which the several Gospels reached their present form through successive stages of elaboration, was in the highest degree intricate; and the methods of literary analysis which he employed were wholly incompatible with the current evangelical conceptions. In some 'Remarks,' published anonymously, Dr. Randolph, Bishop of Oxford, condemned Marsh's researches as 'derogating from the character of the sacred books, and injurious to Christianity as fostering a spirit of scepticism.' That was not, indeed, the judgment of his own university. When he became Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in 1807, and introduced the novel practice of delivering his lectures in English instead of in Latin, the audiences were so large that it was necessary to use the University Church, and townsmen as well as graduates 'listened to them with rapture.' Marsh, on his side, had some suspicion of the Evangelicals. He opposed the formation of a branch of the Bible

Society in Cambridge because it sanctioned a union with Dissenters, and also encouraged the circulation of the Scriptures unaccompanied by the liturgy. The prayer-book must be set beside the Bible as the interpretation of the Church: the eighty-seven questions for curates, which he afterwards drew up for the use of his diocese (he was consecrated Bishop of Llandaff in 1816, and in three years was translated to Peterborough), were known as a 'trap to catch Calvinists.'

II.

No successor was bold enough to adventure further on the path which Marsh had opened. 'That investigation,' it was caustically observed by Mr. Mark Pattison in 1860,[1] 'introduced by a bishop and professor of divinity, has scarcely yet attained a footing in the English Church; but it is excluded not from a conviction of its barrenness, but from a fear that it might prove too fertile in results.' In 1825, however, appeared an anonymous translation of Schleiermacher's *Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, with an introductory account by the translator of the controversy respecting the origin of the first three Gospels since Bishop Marsh's dissertation,—an admirable survey in which one solitary English name appeared amid the German throng. The author was a Cambridge graduate, afterwards to become the historian of Greece and the bishop of St. David's, Connop Thirlwall (1791-1875). The book made an

[1] *Essays and Reviews*, p. 262.

'epoch in the history of English theology,' says the editor of his letters, the late Bishop Perowne. For the introduction frankly asserted (p. 11) that the 'doctrine of inspiration once universally prevalent in the Christian Church, according to which the sacred writers were merely passive organs or instruments of the Holy Spirit' . . . had 'been so long abandoned that it would now be waste of time to attack it.' The operation of the Spirit must be sought, not in any temporary intellectual changes wrought in its subjects, but in the continued presence and action of what is most vital and essential in Christianity itself (p. 19). The English reader was accordingly invited to consider without alarm the treatment of the early chapters of the Gospel as mingled with poetry rather than as the continuous record of actual fact. Compare Luke with Matthew, and the narratives of the birth and infancy of Jesus show no single point in common, except that the nativity took place at Bethlehem. They were not mutually supplemental; on the contrary, the corresponding members of the two successions almost entirely excluded each other. The temptation became a parable. To suppose that it was even a figurative representation of what took place inwardly in Christ, was repudiated as an outrage: 'had he entertained, even in the most transient manner, thoughts of such a nature, he would have ceased to be Christ' (p. 57). It is needless to pursue the critic through the whole gospel-story. At every turn the narrative is studied in connexion with

the parallels in Matthew and Mark for the purpose of determining sources, accounting for peculiarities of handling, and tracing the influences which have brought it into its present shape. The 'historical method,' for which Priestley pleaded, is here unflinchingly applied, subject, however, to the limitations of imperfectly developed critical theories, and the want of definite tests and principles of evidence.

The progress of German criticism not unnaturally excited alarm in a country which hardly realised that it had itself supplied in the previous century some of the leading impulses. Thirlwall had found it necessary to rebuke a Bampton lecturer for denouncing the theology of a people whose very language he did not know. The Regius Professor of divinity at Oxford, Dr. Lloyd, too great a scholar to fall into so gross an abuse, urged upon a young fellow of Oriel the desirability of 'learning something about these German critics.' Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-82) set himself at once to learn German,[1] and spent nearly two years (1825-7) at Göttingen, Berlin, and Bonn. He studied under Eichhorn and Schleiermacher; he made friends with Tholuck and Neander. And not only did he devote himself with extraordinary assiduity to Arabic and Syriac, he further undertook an important and laborious work arising out of the lectures on 'The State of Protestantism in Germany,' delivered at Cambridge in 1825 by the Rev. Hugh James Rose.[2] Pusey's views were finally

[1] Only two persons were said to know it in Oxford, *Life*, vol. i., p. 72.

[2] On this controversy see the *Life*, vol. i., chap. viii.

embodied in a *Historical Inquiry into the Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany*, which appeared in 1828. He was aware that his book might excite some disapproval; 'I expect to be thought one-third mystic, one-third sceptic, and one-third (which will be thought the worst imputation of all) a Methodist, though I am none of the three.'[1] On one side he sympathised with the pietists of the seventeenth century in opposition to the dryness of orthodoxy; on another he had a good word for the critics and philosophers. He commended Lessing for his services to Christianity, and declared that he had restored the key to the right understanding of the Old Testament as the preliminary education of the human race. He affirmed the influence of the Kantian teaching to have been for the time, indeed, injurious, yet permanently beneficial, for it led many to listen to the voice of Nature, *the revelation of God within them* (language which no thorough-going Evangelical could have used). To this was added a hint bearing on the advance of the literary and historical investigation of the Bible. The faith of the Christian, he asserted, depends not on the reception of the one or the other book of Scripture; and it has been a suggestion pregnant with mischief that any doubt respecting any portion of the sacred volume necessarily implies a diminished value for its whole contents, or a weakened reverence and gratitude for its divine Giver. Sentiments such as these

[1] *Life*, vol. i., p. 152.

exposed Pusey to accusations which he had to meet again and again in later years. The book and its sequel (1830) were subsequently withdrawn. As he looked back on the whole controversy after another decade, he defined his position thus:[1]

'I ever believed the plenary inspiration of the whole Bible, and every sentence in it, as far as any doctrine or practice can be elicited from it. I ever believed the human instruments to have been guided by God's Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit never failed them: only I did not think that while He guided them "into all truth," this guidance extended into such minute details and circumstances as in no way affected the truth.'

It was not surprising that Pusey's opponents should draw inferences from his language which he was not prepared to admit. The clerical mind was morbidly sensitive to the smallest symptoms of departure from the most rigid standards of orthodoxy. In 1829 the well known house of Mr. John Murray issued, in a series entitled 'The Family Library,' three little volumes of the *History of the Jews*, by Henry Hart Milman (afterwards Dean of St. Paul's, 1849-68). Scholar and poet—he had made some successful translations from Sanskrit—he wrote as a historian rather than as a theologian The characters of the Old Testament were treated not as supernatural saints but as human beings. Abraham became an eastern sheikh. The passage of the Red Sea was explained by natural causes. The numbers of the wandering Israelites were minimised; and the incidents of their long march were viewed through the veil of allegory spread over the distant past

[1] In a letter of 1841: *Life*, vol. i., p. 174.

by oriental imagination. It was more than public opinion could then bear. Anger and alarm stopped the sale of the book, and the issue of the Family Library ceased.

The most important influence of this age, however, was not exercised by the historian, the critic, or the theologian, but by the genius of Coleridge (1772-1834), which expatiated freely in the regions of poetry, literature, and philosophy, at home in them all, yet limited to none. Reaction against the rationalist necessarianism of Priestley and Hartley which he had embraced at Cambridge, led him through his study of German to the philosophy of Kant and Schelling. Confronted with the prevailing Evangelicalism, he could not reconcile its doctrine of the ruin of human nature with his view of the significance of the higher Reason; and this led to a complete reconstruction of his conception of religion. It was no longer a conviction of supernatural grace borne in upon the sinner from without by the irresistible force of the Spirit; nor was it the appropriation by faith of the merits of the Redeemer in the historic atonement of the Cross. It was already involved in the moral consciousness of man; it lay in the spiritual trusts and affections which constituted the very essence of the soul. These could not be justified by any literary or historic evidences. They were their own witnesses, and there was no higher court of appeal except to an utterance still more persuasive in sympathy or clearer in command. Like Herder and Schleiermacher, therefore,

Coleridge declared that Christianity was a life, not a theological system, and it must be known or realised by living. In other words, the real testimony to it was not an external demonstration but an internal experience. 'The truth revealed through Christ has its evidence in itself, and the proof of its divine authority in its fitness to our nature and needs, the clearness and cogency of this proof being proportionate to the degree of self-knowledge in each individual hearer.'[1] This kind of experience cannot, however, be everywhere uniform and constant. It is apprehended in different forms and with changing intensity according to the specific powers of different persons, or the characteristic influences of different periods. A distinction was accordingly drawn between the intellectual forms of religious belief, which vary from age to age, and the permanent contents of the religious consciousness in aspiration, endeavour, and trust. Even within the New Testament itself, the symbols and metaphors by which the apostolic teachers described the effects of the death of Christ, must be interpreted in the light of the Jewish theology whence they were sometimes derived, or the controversies both within and without the early Church. Coleridge projected vast plans which he never executed, and his philosophy of religion nowhere received systematic or coherent expression. But some years after his death seven letters on inspiration from his pen were issued under the title of *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit* (1840). They

[1] *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*, p. 60.

contained an impassioned protest against the mechanical conceptions of inspiration. The doctrine that every part of the Bible was the direct speech of God turned all these heart-awakening utterances of men of like faculties and passions with ourselves, mourning, rejoicing, suffering, triumphing, into 'a Divina Commedia of a superhuman ventriloquist.'[1] The real evidence of inspiration lay in its power over the human soul. 'Whatever *finds* me, bears witness that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit,—even from the same spirit *which remaining in itself, yet regenerateth all other powers, and in all ages entering into holy souls maketh them friends of God, and prophets.*'[2] The action of the Spirit could not be shut up within the limits of a book: nor on the other hand could it be discerned there everywhere and always. Such an assumption converted the whole body of holy writ into 'a colossal Memnon's head, a hollow passage for a voice, a voice that mocks the voices of many men, and speaks in their names, and yet is but one voice, and the same.'[3]

The question which Coleridge set out to answer—'Is it necessary, or expedient, to insist on the belief of the divine origin and authority of all, and every part of the Canonical books as the condition, or first principle, of Christian Faith?'—received a no less emphatic answer from Dr. Arnold (1795-1842) on the historical side. Trained at Oriel under Coplestone, Whately, and Hampden, who did not allow

[1] *Ibid.* p. 35. [2] *Ibid.* p. 10, quoting *Wisd. of Sol.*, 7[27].
[3] *Ibid. p.* 32.

religious earnestness to discharge them from intellectual activity, he learned German to read Niebuhr's History of Rome in 1825, and made friends with Bunsen two years later. The influence of these teachers was apparent in the *Essay on the right Interpretation and Understanding of the Scriptures* (1831), which he regarded even in the last year of his life as the most important thing he had ever written.[1] It was founded on the conceptions which his historical studies had rendered familiar to him. Here was no product of a single life, like the Koran, whose parts all claimed equal authority, and were composed at one time. Each character, each act, in the Old Testament, must be considered in the light of its surrounding circumstances, and the moral development which the people of Israel had then attained. If Abraham denied his wife, or Moses slaughtered the Midianites, or Saul massacred the women and children of Amalek, their conduct must be judged under the conditions of their age. From the narratives of miracle he turned to the progress of spiritual truth; suppose the wonders of Exodus disproved, 'the divinity of the Mosaic Dispensation would then rest on its own intrinsic evidence, crowned as it is by Christianity.' A distinction, therefore, arose between the truth of Revelation and the inspiration of the historical record. Objections of a critical and historical kind might affect the inspiration of the narrative books, but their credibility did not depend upon their inspiration. The Bible must be

[1] *Life* (8th ed.), vol. i. p. 231.

interpreted humanly, and questions of history, criticism, and science, must not be confounded with Christian faith. So he affirmed (1840) that the announcement (in *Isaiah* vii. 14) of the birth of a child who should be called Immanuel, had a manifest historical meaning as applied to the prophet's wife (Letter ccxxii). To another correspondent he wrote from Fox How in the same month (Letter cxix.) :—

'I have long thought that the greater part of the book of Daniel is most certainly a very late work of the time of the Maccabees; and the pretended prophecy about the Kings of Greece and Persia, and of the North and South, is mere history, like the poetical prophecies in Virgil and elsewhere.'

The principles of historical criticism were thus fully enunciated. Was there any one ready to apply them? How far did the law of the Church permit them to be carried?

III.

The death of Arnold in 1842 was followed by the publication of Stanley's famous biography of his old master in 1844. The book had the significance, if not the intention, of a manifesto. Oxford was then convulsed by the Tractarian movement. Newman had resigned St. Mary's, because, as he said, he thought the Church of Rome the Catholic Church, though he had not yet been received into it, and was living in seclusion at Littlemore. The great controversy had absorbed all energies. Philosophy was ignored; historical study—save of the Fathers—was neglected. Scientific and literary pursuits had been

decried as frivolous and vain. Ecclesiastical politics alone secured attention. Baur had already carried the Pastoral Epistles into the second century; and Strauss had interpreted the Gospels as largely the product of myth. Dim echoes of their critical methods excited extraordinary alarm. The timid felt themselves in danger of being forced to Rome in one direction, or swept away by infidelity in the other. Vague apprehensions weighed on even strong and noble minds, and indisposed them for action, lest misunderstanding by others should endanger their cause.

The future, then, as always, lay with the young. Stanley (1815-81) had laid especial stress on the importance attached by Arnold to the critical study of theology. Arnold had even planned a sort of Rugby 'Paul'; and as early as 1836 was at work on the first epistle to the Thessalonians, preferring to bring them out first rather than the Pastoral Epistles. The grounds of this choice were twofold. The historian's instinct pleaded, 'the chronological order of the Epistles is undoubtedly the natural one'; while the disputant's adroitness added, 'they will not be thought to have been chosen for purposes of controversy, and yet they may really be made to serve my purpose quite as well' (Letter cxliv.). The purpose of the master was cherished in the mind of the pupil, and suggested the subject of his sermons as Select Preacher to the University, in 1846-7, on the Apostolic age. By that time he had already found a fellow-worker in Benjamin Jowett (1817-93).

Driven by the rain one afternoon into the shelter of a quarry (1846), the two friends amused themselves with sketching the outline of a common plan.[1] The details of the scheme have not been preserved, but it required first a close study of the Gospels. Jowett shrank from no intellectual labour, and found a refreshing stimulus in the writings of the much dreaded Baur, whose great work on Paul (1845) he described as 'the ablest book I ever read on St. Paul's Epistles; a remarkable combination of Philological and Metaphysical power, without the intrusion of Modern Philosophy.'[2] The manifold labours of the two friends delayed the progress of their enterprise. But it was at length completed: Stanley dealt with the letters to the Corinthians, Jowett with those to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans: and the volumes appeared in March, 1855, on the same day. Different destinies awaited the two books. Stanley's came in due course to a second edition, but attracted comparatively little notice. Jowett's soon aroused keen dislike and hostility. The actual theological standpoint was not very different. The translation might be fresher, the commentary more independent; but still more striking was a subtle difference in depth and method. In his supplemental Essays Jowett did not disguise his opposition to current theological ideas, and in his discussion of the Atonement he stated the moral objections to the extreme Evangelical conception with even passionate

[1] *Life and Letters of Jowett*, vol. i., p. 100.

[2] *Life and Letters*, vol. i., p. 142.

vehemence. 'There are idols of the temple,' he declared, 'as well as idols of the market-place. These idols consist in human reasonings and definitions which are erected into Articles of Faith. We are willing to adore in silence, but not the inventions of man. The controversialist naturally thinks that in assailing the doctrine of satisfaction as inconsistent with truth and morality we are fighting not with himself but with God.' Before the leaven of the new book had had time to work, Jowett (who had been repulsed at the election for the Mastership of Balliol the year before) was appointed by Lord Palmerston in June to the Regius Professorship of Greek. In the autumn the new Professor was denounced to the Vice-Chancellor of the University as having denied the Catholic Faith. Jowett was accordingly summoned to appear before him and subscribe the Articles anew. On December 15th he wrote to Stanley the pathetic words, 'You will perhaps have seen in the newspapers that I have taken the meaner part and signed.'[1]

A few years later a fresh plan was communicated to Stanley. It arose with the Rev. H. B. Wilson, Bampton lecturer in 1851, and vicar of Great Staughton, Huntingdonshire. In a letter from Keswick in August, 1858, Jowett thus unfolded the scheme:

'Wilson wishes me to write to you respecting a volume of Theological Essays which he has already mentioned, the object of which, however, he thinks he has not clearly set before you, trusting to my being at Oxford, etc.

[1] *Life and Letters*, vol. i., p. 239.

'The persons who have already joined in the plan are Wilson, R. Williams of King's, Pattison, Grant, Temple, Müller, if he has time, and myself. The object is to say what we think freely within the limits of the Church of England. . . . . We do not wish to do anything rash or irritating to the public or the University, but we are determined not to submit to this abominable system of terrorism, which prevents the statement of the plainest facts, and makes true theology or theological education impossible. Pusey and his friends are perfectly aware of your opinions, and the Dean's, and Temple's, and Müller's, but they are determined to prevent your expressing them. I do not deny that in the present state of the world the expression of them is a matter of great nicety and care, but is it possible to do any good by a system of reticence? For example, I entirely agree with you that no greater good could be accomplished for religion and morality than the abolition of all subscriptions; but how will this ever be promoted in the least degree, or how will it be possible for anyone in high station ever to propose it, if we only talk it over in private?'

The volume appeared in March, 1860, under the title of *Essays and Reviews*. It is somewhat difficult now to understand the commotion which it excited. But in the interval, the *Origin of Species* had been published in 1859; and the meeting of the British Association for the advancement of Science at Oxford in the summer of 1860 had drawn all eyes to the famous encounter between Mr. Huxley and Bishop Wilberforce. The air was full of strange cries and inuendoes; but the first assault on the Essayists came from an unexpected quarter. In the October number of the *Westminster Review* Mr. Frederick Harrison, then fellow of Wadham, published an article on 'Neo-Christianity,' in which he denounced their position as one of hopeless inconsistency, and called on the offending clergymen

to abandon their preferments in the church. The attack was renewed by the Bishop of Oxford in his autumn charge, and in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1861. The clerical ranks were now being roused to battle. Addresses, memorials, remonstrances, appeals, were sent up to the Archbishops from every side. Early in February a meeting of Bishops was held at Lambeth, and it was decided to reply in concert to an address from the Rural Deanery of Dorsetshire. The Archbishop of Canterbury issued a letter on the 12th which expressed the pain of his Episcopal brethren that any clergyman should have published such opinions as those of the incriminated book, and roundly declared—'We cannot understand how these opinions can be held consistently with an honest subscription to the formularies of our Church, with many of the fundamental doctrines of which they appear to us essentially at variance.' The names of the Archbishop of York and the four-and-twenty Bishops followed that of the Primate.

Great distress was caused by the attitude of the Bishop of London, Dr. Tait. He was understood to have said in private that he saw nothing to object to in the essays of Temple, Pattison, and Jowett; and now he seemed to involve them in a common condemnation. Jowett wrote a long letter to him, but did not send it. 'It is natural in him, but it ruins confidence,' he remarked;[1] and remained in friendship with his former tutor. From the Head-

[1] *Life and Letters*, vol. i., p. 297.

master of Rugby came letters of earnest remonstrance:

'Many years ago you urged on us from the University pulpit to undertake the critical study of the Bible. You said that it was a dangerous study, but indispensable. You described its difficulties, and those who listened must have felt a confidence (as I assuredly did, for I was there) that if they took your advice and entered on the task, you at any rate would never join in treating them unjustly if their study had brought with it the difficulties you described. Such a study, so full of difficulties, imperatively demands freedom for its condition. To tell a man to study, and yet bid him, under heavy penalties, come to the same conclusions with those who have not studied, is to mock him. If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded.'[1]

Stanley was also deeply grieved at the Bishops' action, and entered into a long correspondence with the Bishop of London. He pleaded the injustice of the condemnation, and urged the danger of any attempt to curtail the liberties of the Church by episcopal declarations on matters which ought to be decided by the courts specially provided for the purpose. In the *Edinburgh* for April the dauntless Canon of Christ Church[2] replied to the onslaught in the previous *Quarterly*; he quoted latitudinarian precedents from Anglican divines, and even hinted that among the men who had joined in the condemnation there was one who was himself responsible in his published writings for opinions similar to those which were now denounced.[3]

[1] *Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. i., p. 291.

[2] Stanley held his stall as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

[3] 'The critical essay of Schleiermacher on St. Luke's Gospel was ushered into the world by a Preface of the translator, which bears on every page the

The Lower House of Convocation naturally supported the Bishops' censure. But their condemnation of a book which one leading speaker admitted that he had never read, carried with it no legal penalties. Very different was the spirit of the proceedings opened in 1861 by the Bishop of Salisbury against Dr. Rowland Williams for his account of Bunsen's Biblical researches, and by Mr. Fendall against the Rev. H. B. Wilson whose essay dealt with the position of the National Church. The cases were heard separately in the court of Arches by Dr. Lushington, but judgment was not delivered till June 25, 1862. A number of charges were rejected, in terms which were calculated to extend the liberties of the clergy within legal limits as far as possible. Dr. Williams was alleged to have maintained that the book of Daniel was not written by Daniel, and that Jonah was not a historical person. 'All this may be erroneous,' coldly remarked the judge,[1] 'but what Article is contravened?' Dr. Williams had spoken of the necessity of a verifying faculty in judging of Scripture. 'What is the meaning of these words?' asked Dr. Lushington. 'I apprehend that it must mean this, that the clergy (for I speak of these only) are at liberty to reject parts of Scripture upon

unmistakable stamp of the masterly hand of the Bishop of St. David's.' With true insight he described the breadth of the whole issue. 'If there be a conspiracy, it is one far more formidable than that of the seven Essayists. For it is a conspiracy in which half the rising generation, one quarter of the Bench of Bishops, the most leading spirits of our clergy, have been, and are, and will be engaged, whatever be the results of the present controversy.'

[1] *Ecclesiastical Judgments*, edited by Brodrick and Fremantle, 1865, p. 259.

their own opinion that the narrative is inherently incredible; to disregard precepts in Holy Writ because they think them evidently wrong. Whatever I may think as to the danger of the liberty so claimed, still if the liberty do not extend to the impugning of the Articles of Religion or the Formularies, the matter is beyond my cognisance.'

Finally, Dr. Williams was condemned (1) for having characterised the Bible without qualification as an expression of devout reason, which was held to be inconsistent with the statement in the sixth Article that it was written by the interposition of God; (2) for errors connected with the atonement; and (3) for false teaching about justification by faith. Mr. Wilson was condemned for having implied that the Scriptures were not in parts the Word of God, for having denied any distinction between covenanted and uncovenanted mercies, and for having declared it a matter of hope that finally all, both great and small, might escape everlasting condemnation. Notice was duly given of appeal, and the two cases went up to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.[1]

[1] The judicial procedure of Dr. Lushington was in marked contrast with the treatment meted out a few years before to the Rev. Dr. Samuel Davidson by the authorities of the Lancashire Independent College, in which he was professor. Dr. Davidson had published a learned Introduction to the New Testament (1849-51) which had won the commendation of authorities like Archdeacon Hare and Dr. Thirlwall. In 1854 he was invited to issue a new edition of Horne's *Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures*, and it was arranged that he should entirely re-write vol. ii., on the origin and authorship of the books of the Old Testament. This volume appeared in 1856. In dealing with the Pentateuch Dr. Davidson recounted a number of phenomena inconsistent with contemporary authorship, recognised two documents from

In the meantime the situation was complicated by a fresh issue. After the Lushington judgment, in the autumn of 1862, England was startled by the publication of the first part of a treatise on the Pentateuch by the Bishop of Natal. Dr. Colenso was little known in this country except as the author of a successful manual of arithmetic, though just before his consecration he had dedicated a volume of sermons to the Rev. F. D. Maurice. But on the Zulus of Natal he had made a deep impression. With untiring toil he had spent seven years among them; he had compiled a grammar and dictionary of the Zulu language (the latter extending to 552 pp.); he had prepared Zulu reading-books, and manuals of instruction for natives in English, history, geography, astronomy, and other branches of useful knowledge; he had translated the books of Genesis, Exodus, and Samuel, together with the whole of the New Testament, into the Zulu tongue;—an amount of work which (as Dean Stanley told the members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel some years later) would keep alive his fame as a missionary long after his persecutors were all dead

Genesis to Numbers, emphasized the separate character of Deuteronomy, and suggested that the whole had been editorially compiled under the monarchy. The Trust-deed of the College affirmed that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain the revealed will of God, and are therefore the sole and exclusive authority in the Christian Church. But it specified nothing concerning the authorship of any book from Genesis to Revelation. The Committee of the College, however, were alarmed. They passed resolutions concerning the dangerous character of Dr. Davidson's teaching. When he requested them to specify the passages to which they objected, they declined the task 'as unnecessary,' and they left him no choice but to resign.

and buried. But his labours brought him face to face with grave difficulties. Not only did his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (1861) open up the whole question of the salvation of the heathen and compel him to confront the doctrine of everlasting punishment, he was further exposed to the penetrating questions of his converts. 'While translating the story of the Flood,' he wrote to Dr. Harold Browne,[1] 'I have had a simple-minded but intelligent native,—one with the docility of a child but the reasoning powers of mature age,—look up and ask "Is all that true? Do you really believe that all this happened thus,—that all the beasts and birds and creeping things upon the earth, large and small, from hot countries and cold, came thus by pairs and entered into the ark with Noah? And did Noah gather food for them *all*, for the beasts and birds of prey, as well as for the rest?" My heart answered in the words of the prophet "Shall a man speak lies in the name of the Lord?" I dared not do so.' Those questions started the investigation into the origin and composition of the Pentateuch.

The fact that critical views resembling those reached by Dr. Colenso have long been taught with undisputed authority in the universities and theological colleges of Great Britain, makes it difficult for this generation to realise the terror and wrath excited by the episcopal application of arithmetical tests to the narratives of the books of

[1] The letter was not sent, *Life*, vol. i. p. 482.

Exodus and Numbers. Ridicule was poured upon the simple Zulu. The bishop's objections, it was alleged, contained nothing new (which was substantially true): they had been confuted again and again (which was not true). Matthew Arnold, not yet the apostle of culture or the inventor of the parable of the three Lord Shaftesburys, rebuked him for not having written in Latin, like Spinoza. In spite of the simplicity and earnestness of his declarations of Christian faith, extravagant charges of infidelity were flung against him. The Bishop of Carlisle denounced him to Sunday school children as 'doing the Devil's work'; the Bishop of Manchester ascribed to him a 'savage glee and exultation which would rather become a successful fiend than the minister of a Christian congregation.'[1] A Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury reported against the book (1863); and at the earnest request of the Bishop of Oxford ten Bishops of the province endorsed the condemnation, the Bishops of London and St. David's vainly endeavouring to stay their hand. Later in the year Dr. Thirlwall delivered a memorable Charge, in which he pointed out the futility of the Committee's report. The resolution by which the offending book was condemned, assumed a paternal authority which rather suited an earlier period in the education of the world, and presupposed a child-like docility and obedience in those over whom it was exercised, such as were very rarely to be found. The censure had no value, for

[1] Colenso, *Pentateuch*, part iv., 2nd ed., p. xvi.

it did not point out the errors involved, or state the doctrine which the book had impugned. In grave and weighty words he declared that the Church had not attempted to fence the study of the Scripture either for clergy or laity with any restriction as to the subjects of enquiry, and he added, 'If the enquiry is to be free, it is impossible consistently to prescribe the results.'[1]

This calm and statesmanlike temper was unique upon the Episcopal Bench. The Bishop of Oxford and some of his colleagues were apparently in correspondence with the Bishop of Capetown, who summoned Dr. Colenso to appear before him. Dr. Gray believed himself possessed of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal, and refused to commit the case to the English courts. 'If the Church,' he wrote, 'does not denounce the judgment which I hear is to be delivered *in re* Essays and Reviews, she will cease to witness for Christ. She must destroy that master-piece of Satan for the overthrow of the faith, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as her final court of appeal, or it will destroy her.'[2] The trial took place in November, 1863, in Dr. Colenso's absence, on charges based on the Commentary on Romans, and the treatise on the Pentateuch. The Bishop of Capetown declared the Bishop of Natal deposed, and forbade him to exercise any divine office within the province.

[1] *Remains*, 'Charges,' vol. ii. pp. 68 and 61.

[2] *Life of Bishop Gray*, vol. ii. p. 113, quoted in *Life of Bishop Colenso*, vol. i. p. 276.

The Capetown proceedings roused an active sympathy for Dr. Colenso in the minds of many who did not approve of his style of Biblical criticism. It was felt that the pretensions of Bishop Gray must be resisted, and a defence fund was started to enable an appeal to be decided in the proper court at home. Before the Capetown trial the case of the condemned Essayists had been heard before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in June, 1863. The judgment (which Bishop Gray anticipated in the letter already quoted) was delivered by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Westbury, on February 8, 1864. Three charges only remained out of the original eighteen 'articles' brought against the defendants; but they dealt with great themes, (1) Inspiration, (2) Justification, (3) Eternal Punishment. 'I saw at once,' reported Stanley, 'from the absence of the two Archbishops and the fallen countenance of Phillimore, that we were safe.'[1]

'No one who was present,' he wrote afterwards, 'can forget the interest with which the audience in the crowded Council Chamber listened to sentence after sentence as they rolled along from the smooth and silvery tongue of the Lord Chancellor, enunciating with a lucidity which made it seem impossible that any other statement of the case was conceivable, and with a studied moderation of language which at times seemed to border on irony,—first the principles on which the judgment was to proceed, and then the examination, part by part, and word by word, of each of the three charges that remained, till at the close, not one was left, and the appellants remained in possession of the field.'[2]

The result was that according to the highest legal authorities it was not penal for a clergyman of the

[1] *Life and Letters*, vol. ii., p. 43. [2] *Essays on Church and State*, 1870, p. 101.

Anglican Church to express a hope that by the mercy of God all men might ultimately be saved; nor was it necesssry to believe that every part of every book of the Bible was written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The inspiration of any part of Scripture might be denied, and its authenticity rejected. The one thing which might not be impugned was its *canonicity*, the fact that it belonged to the sacred collections of the Old or New Testament.

This judgment has been the charter of free enquiry into the origin and composition of the Scriptures within the Established Church of England. It has never been recalled. Under its shelter the studies of a generation have been prosecuted, and the Regius Professor of Hebrew at the University of Oxford tranquilly expounds, as scientifically assured, results which his predecessor would cheerfully have laid down his life to avert.[1] To Dr. Pusey and his friends the decision of the Privy Council Committee gave inevitable distress. A Committee of which Dr. Pusey was a member issued a declaration from Oxford in the following terms — 'We, the undersigned, Presbyters and Deacons in Holy Orders. . . . . declare our firm belief that the Church of England and Ireland maintains without reserve or qualification the inspiration and divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures as not only containing but being the

[1] See the well-known *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* by the Rev. Prof. S. R. Driver.

Word of God.' It was sent to nearly 25,000 clergy in England and Ireland. About 11,000 signed, including nine Oxford professors. With greater caution all the divinity professors of Cambridge refrained. The declaration could have no legal effect; and the vagueness of its wording gave it little value even as a pious utterance of opinion. The Synodical condemnation of *Essays and Reviews* by the Convocation of Canterbury in August, 1864, was similarly destitute of authority. The appeal of Dr. Colenso against his deposition was heard before the Committee of the Privy Council before the close of 1864, and judgment was delivered on March 20, 1865. The proceedings instituted by the Bishop of Capetown, the judgment and the sentence which he pronounced, were all annulled as illegal. Dr. Colenso returned to Natal to care for his diocese and continue his researches. Faithful to his principles, Bishop Gray defiantly excommunicated him, and declared him 'separated from the communion of the Church, and to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen man and a publican.' But this did not hinder the Bishop of Natal from first criticising and then following Wellhausen, and supporting the cause of Langalibalele.

Liberty of Biblical criticism was thus secured within the Church of England.[1] The progress of

[1] No other similar case has arisen within her borders since. The Free Church of Scotland, however, felt it necessary in 1876 to proceed against one of its most brilliant scholars, the late Prof. W. Robertson Smith, of the Free Church College in Aberdeen, whose article 'Bible' in the new Encyclopædia Britan-

forty years is registered at the present moment in the modern dictionaries which sum up from different points of view the advance of historical knowledge and critical theory.[1] Two other movements followed the settlement of the struggle. One of these culminated in the Revision of the Authorised Version, which will be described in the next lecture. The other was not, indeed, without immediate success, but has yet to reach its goal. When the excitement aroused by Dr. Colenso was at its height, Stanley addressed a brilliant letter to the Bishop of London urging some relaxation in the terms of clerical subscription. The subject was not new. It had been brought before Parliament in a bill introduced by Sir William Meredith in 1772. Bishop Stanley had signed a petition in its favour in 1840, which Archbishop Whately had presented to the House of Lords. In the explosion of animosity and alarm which followed the publication of Tract XC. in 1841, the movement had no chance of securing impartial consideration. In 1854, however, undergraduates at the Universities were relieved by Parliament from the obligation of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and ten years later, after the Privy Council

nica excited grave disapproval. A Committee was appointed by the General Assembly to investigate the case. Prof. Robertson Smith defended himself with singular skill, but he was finally removed from his chair by a decision of the Assembly in June, 1881. Similar proceedings were recently threatened against another distinguished teacher, the Rev. Prof. G. Adam Smith, of the Free Church College, Glasgow, but they were happily averted by a vote of the Assembly in May, 1902.

[1] See Dr. Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, and *Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne and Dr. Sutherland Black.

Judgment, two bills in favour of the abolition or relaxation of tests were brought forward by Mr. Dodson and Mr. Bouverie. The Government appointed a Royal Commission of Enquiry; and in 1865 Lord Granville carried a Bill through the House of Lords which was sent down to the Commons and adopted. The old formula requiring 'unfeigned assent and consent' to all and everything within the covers of the Book of Common Prayer was withdrawn, and the new phrase substituted for it was understood to be less stringent, 'I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer, and to the Form for the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.'

The movement was immediately applied to the Universities, and an active agitation was begun for the abolition of University tests, which culminated in the Act carried in 1871, during the first administration of Mr. Gladstone. This measure exempted degrees in Divinity from its operation. A Committee of the House of Lords was engaged in hearing evidence upon the question, and just as the second reading came on in the Upper House, Jowett, now Master of Balliol, gave evidence before the Committee. He proposed to abolish the tests even for

Divinity professors. His ideal was that Divinity should be altogether free, and that facts and opinions in theology should be examined like other facts and opinions :[1]

'I should like to put before the Committee this consideration. Supposing you had one class of professors bound by tests; for instance, supposing the Church of England Divinity professors were bound by tests, and other Divinity professors were not bound by tests, which do you suppose would have the greater authority and weight—the persons who were free to speak what they thought, or the persons who were obliged to speak within a certain limit? Of the latter a great suspicion would arise that they said not what they thought, but what they were compelled by the test to say.'

The rapid advances of critical, historical, scientific, and philosophical enquiry have carried theological studies into regions which the English mind thirty years ago had hardly begun to explore. Great changes have silently taken place. Churches which were once seriously opposed have drawn together, and doctrines over which former generations hotly disputed have been quietly dismissed. The principles of the untrammelled investigation of the Scriptures have been amply vindicated by a series of distinguished scholars, who have raised the standard of theological education in all branches of the Christian Church, and have thrown off the deadening influences of ecclesiastical tradition. But it is not only the professors of Divinity for whom liberty is an essential condition. Behind the ideal of free teaching in theology lies another more important still,—that of a Free Cuurch, where pastor and

[1] *Letters of Benjamin Jowett*, p. 24.

people shall be alike pledged only to a common pursuit of truth, and a common recognition of veracity as the first requisite of worship. To such a goal the path is long and difficult. A thousand obstacles of association and affection, of anxiety and apprehension, threaten it. Which of the great historic Churches in this country will make the first step? Of one thing they may be assured by those who have trodden it through toil and obscurity for more than two hundred years. Though they should suffer loss, obloquy, and exclusion, they will never wish to turn back.

LECTURE II.

THE REVISED VERSION

THE movement in favour of freedom of Biblical study within the Church of England secured its immediate end by the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But its consequences were not limited to the withdrawal of all barriers from the historical investigation of the Scriptures. Its indirect issues were also highly significant. It produced an urgent call for the relaxation of the terms of Subscription imposed on all candidates for orders in the Anglican Church, and it gave a powerful impetus to the growing demand for a revision of the Authorised Version of the Bible. Before proceeding to sketch the effects of modern investigation on our conception of the chief constituents of the Old and New Testaments, it seems desirable to describe the general conditions which created this demand, and the answer which it received. What after all was the Bible? Where was it to be found, and why was the representation of it by King James's translators no longer adequate?

An attempt to answer these questions carries us at once into the heart of intricate and laborious studies. But they cannot be neglected by anyone who desires to realise the full significance of the changed aspect of the books of his religion.

I.

In an appendix to his edition of the *Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (1855)[1] Stanley had enumerated various defects in the received translation from the original Greek. There were obscurities arising from want of care in punctuation; neglect of the original order frequently led to a false emphasis; and positive inaccuracy sometimes perverted the apostle's real meaning. Such errors might occasionally be ascribed to theological fear or partiality; sometimes they were caused by retaining the Greek or Latin words of previous translations (such as 'heresies' for 'sects,' 'charity' for 'love,' and even 'church' for 'congregation'); in great part they resulted from an imperfect attention to the apostle's language,—to the meaning of tenses, to the insertion or omission of the definite article—or from carelessness in rendering the same Greek word by different English words (very often in the same context). Both he and his colleague in the enterprise, Jowett, found it necessary, therefore, again and again to correct the Authorised Version.

It was of course obvious that more than two centuries of toil on the classical writers had ren-

[1] Vol. ii., appendix B. See Lect. I., *ante*, p. 26.

dered the knowledge of Greek far more exact than was possible in the days of King James. The study of language had assumed a new phase early in the century as the classification of its great families had been made possible by the accumulation of new material, and in particular by the discovery of Sanskrit, so that philology had entered on its scientific stage. When George Benedict Winer, therefore, proposed in 1822 'so far as the case admitted, to apply the results of the rational philology, as obtained and diffused by Hermann and his school, to the Greek of the New Testament,'[1] he really inaugurated a new era in the interpretation of the New Testament records. Grammatical inaccuracy was no longer tolerable. Winer's treatise supplied the linguistic basis for the best German and English work, and became, as the Bishop of Gloucester has recently remarked, 'the true, though remote fountain-head of revision, and, more particularly, of the revision of the New Testament.'[2] A similar influence on Old Testament study, of an even more far-reaching kind, was exercised by the great Semitic philologist of Halle, Gesenius, whose Hebrew Dictionary (1812) and Grammar (1813) opened a new phase in the treatment of the literature of Israel, while his Commentary on the book of Isaiah (1821-29) showed how the criticism of language might be supplemented by the criticism of history.

[1] Preface to the sixth German edition of the *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 1855.

[2] *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture*, 1901, p. 8.

But behind the necessities of grammar and lexicography, the distinction between prose and poetry, the sensibility to differences of style, the perception of the fitness of words no longer in common use or limited to some special theological meaning,—all of which are serious elements in the translator's problem,—there lay in the background a much larger and more difficult question. What was he to translate? The original autographs of the Biblical authors had long ceased to exist. The Authorised Version of the New Testament was made from a printed text[1] the pedigree of which could be traced back[2] to the first edition of Erasmus in 1516, and substantially identical with that afterwards described in the Latin preface to the Leyden edition of 1633 as the *textus ab omnibus receptus*, the 'text received by all,' or 'the received text.' The printed editions were of course founded on the hand-written copies (manuscripts) which had been in use before the invention of printing in 1454. What was the value of these copies, and of the texts founded upon them?[3] Once more, the experience gained in the treatment of classical literature provides the answer on behalf

[1] The word 'text' is here used in the technical sense of the Greek form of the several books.

[2] Through Beza's fourth edition (1588) and the *Editio Regia* of Stephens (1550).

[3] It must always be remembered that the work of Erasmus was that of a pioneer. It was executed in great haste at Basle in 1516 in order to anticipate the publication of the great Complutensian edition of Cardinal Ximenes. He had few MSS. at hand, and they were of very late date. In his first edition their defective state compelled him actually to retranslate a few verses in the book of Revelation from the current mediæval Latin back into Greek!

of the Scriptures. When Jowett issued his edition of the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, etc. (1855), the first words of his Introduction ran thus :—

'No one who is acquainted with Sophocles or Thucydides in the volumes of Dindorf or Bekker, would be willing to reprint the text of those authors as it is to be found in editions of two centuries ago. No apology is therefore needed for laying aside the "Textus Receptus" of the New Testament.'

Jowett and Stanley took a short way out of the difficulty. They did not, as Tregelles and Alford were then slowly and laboriously doing, endeavour to construct a new text for themselves; they adopted that of the great German scholar Lachmann;[1] and introduced into their translations a further set of changes designed to bring the Authorised Version into harmony with Lachmann's Greek.[2]

In what respect, then, was Lachmann's text better than that of Erasmus, or that which bore the proud title of the 'Received'? The answer will become apparent hereafter. In order to detach the question from all misleading associations, let us consider an analogous case in another field.

The last century brought to the West the knowledge of the great religions of the East. It was discovered that they, too, had their collections of sacred books, and the interest of scholars, once roused, sought to make them available for European

[1] See below, p. 65.

[2] Ellicott based his *Galatians* (1854) on Tischendorf's text, see his interesting note on p.15. He only permitted himself to depart from the A.V. 'where it appeared to be *incorrect, inexact, insufficient,* or *obscure*' (p. 20).

students. The ancient Scriptures of Buddhism, for example, containing the earliest record of the teachings of Gotama the Buddha 500 years before Christ, are estimated to contain twice as many words as our Bible.[1] Nearly the whole of this vast mass of writings has been published in this country during the last five-and-twenty years. On what materials are these various texts founded? The student discovers that the books exist in the same language among the Buddhist peoples of Ceylon, Burma, and Siam, and he procures the best copies available from those distant lands. They are written upon palm leaves specially prepared, without divisions of words, in the hand-writing of the country where they are produced.[2] When they are compared together, it is soon found that there are numerous differences among them. Peculiarities of spelling distinguish those from the contiguous regions of Burma and Siam against those from Ceylon. But more serious variations occur. Letters are accidentally dropped out; similar letters are confused;[3] words or even clauses are omitted as the copyist's eye passes to some similar phrase on a line below, and he continues his work in ignorance of what he has overlooked. Or perhaps familiarity with partial repetitions elsewhere in the sacred books unconsciously suggests to him some other close to a sentence, some different

[1] So Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 18-20: he adds, 'a translation of them into English would be about four times as long.'

[2] In Siam, the devout liberality of the king has recently printed a Siamese text of the entire Canon.

[3] These, of course, vary in the several Scripts, owing to the differences of the characters.

ending to a religious formula; or it may be that he deliberately undertakes to harmonise divergences by reducing them to concord. In all these ways may the original text be miscopied and impaired; and the error, once set travelling, begets new mistakes through further blundering or through unsuccessful efforts at correction.

The comparison of several manuscripts soon, however, establishes certain relations among them, and the student learns to trust one more than another. As the Scriptures were originally carried to Burma and Siam from Ceylon, his tendency is first to rely on the Singhalese tradition; but it is plain that a good MS. from Burma may be of more value than a carelessly copied text from Ceylon, derived perhaps from a no less faulty antecedent. Are there any aids for restoration? The ancient commentaries, transmitted for many centuries along with the text, often embody continuous passages of it. They have their own liability to error, but this is lessened by the care and attention bestowed on the transcription of the hallowed words. There are, again, occasional quotations from the Canon embodied in post-canonical treatises, and when these can be identified, fresh support may be gained not only for the limited passage in question, but indirectly for the context or the general character of a whole manuscript. Or, lastly, one or more of the holy books may have been translated out of the ancient sacred tongue into some vernacular, and the help of a native version may be available, which, even though relatively modern,

may supply important evidence. The Commentaries, quotations, and versions, thus guide the student in the preparation of his text.

The process of determining the text of the New Testament is not dissimilar; but the materials now within reach are enormously more copious; and the principles on which they are to be employed have been only slowly elaborated by many generations of scholarship. Let us glance at some aspects of their application in both the Old Testament and the New.

II.

The scholars of the seventeenth century, standing nearer to the version of King James's translators, often showed themselves less unwilling to amend it than some of their successors in the nineteenth. As early as 1645 Dr. Lightfoot, preaching before the House of Commons, urged members to 'think of a review and survey of the translation of the Bible,' that 'the three nations might come to understand the proper and genuine study of the Scriptures, by an exact, vigorous, and lively translation.'[1] Eight years later, in 1653, an order was made by the Long Parliament, and a bill was brought in 'for a new translation of the Bible out of the original tongues.' The plan was frustrated by the Dissolution, but the proposal was not dropped. On the 16th of January, 1657, the Grand Committee of Religion ordered a sub-committee to advise with Walton, Cudworth, and others, respecting translations and impressions

[1] Quoted by Eadie, *The English Bible*, 1876, vol. ii., p. 344.

of the Bible. The Committee met several times at Lord Whitelocke's house, 'and had the most learned men of the Oriental tongues to consult with in this great business, and diverse excellent and learned observations of some mistakes in the translations of the Bible in English, which yet was agreed to be the best of any translation in the world.'[1]

The Parliaments of the eighteenth century troubled themselves no more on the matter. But there was no lack of interest both within and without the Established Church. Two powerful impulses had been given to Biblical study, one affecting especially the Old Testament, and the other the New. The first was the publication in 1657 of Walton's great Polyglot, which set beside the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testaments a collection of ancient versions in Greek, Syriac, Latin, etc., and displayed, in the Old Testament particularly, many variations from the received Hebrew text. The second was due to the issue in 1707 of the New Testament by Dr. Mill, formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, who became Principal of St. Edmund Hall in 1685. He reprinted the Greek text of the great French printer, Robert Estienne (or Stephens), in 1550; but he added the readings of nearly one hundred MSS., the total number of variations being reckoned at about 30,000. The work had cost him thirty years of labour; his death, a fortnight after its appearance,

[1] Whitelocke's *Memorials*, quoted by Stoughton, *Church of the Commonwealth*, p. 150.

saved him from being wounded by the hostility which it at first excited. The most brilliant of English scholars, Richard Bentley, of Cambridge, was eager in its defence, and himself laid down the lines of a new edition which had to wait more than a hundred years before a critic could arise—in the person of Lachmann—with the insight needed to extend and complete the design. These two sets of influences affected the conception of the original text. There were others, which only concerned the translation, derived from the literary taste of the age, which disliked the archaic flavour of Elizabethan expressions, and demanded that what had been already done for the classics should be equally applied to the Bible.[1]

[1] Thus the Rev. E. Harwood (a Presbyterian minister verging towards Unitarian opinions,—he preached the funeral sermon of Dr. John Taylor, at Chowbent, Lancashire, in 1761), published in 1758 *A Liberal Translation of the New Testament, being an Attempt to translate the Sacred Writings with the same Freedom, Spirit, and Elegance with which other English Translations from the Greek Classics have been lately executed.* The book was enriched with numerous classical parallels, but its style has ceased to be commendable: thus *Luke* xiv. 16, 'An opulent gentleman prepared a grand and splendid entertainment.' Harwood did better work than this on the text (see below).

In 1764 Anthony Purver, of the Society of Friends, published *A New and Literal Translation of all the Books of the Old and New Testaments.* A few sentences from his Introduction throw an interesting light on the literary feeling of his time. 'It is well known that those called the living Languages do alter, especially ours, who are such a changeable People. Hence it is necessary that new *Translations* should be made from one Time or Century to another, accommodated to the present Use of speaking or writing.' After pointing out that this had been done for the classics, he continued —'Why should the Scripture meet with less regard? Is it to be thereby more exposed to Ridicule and Contempt in our Libertine Age? But there are some who seem possessed with a notion, or bigotry, that the last Translation in King James's Reign must not be altered; though several new ones had been made before, when the Oldness of the Languages, as they were not long

The theological interest of the first half of the eighteenth century was largely absorbed by the Deistical controversy, and it was not till the publication of Lowth's famous lectures on Hebrew poetry in 1753 that any fruitful labour on the Old Testament was initiated. A little group of scholars, however, redeemed the age from reproach.[1] The Primate, Archbishop Secker, bequeathed to the Lambeth Library two large Bibles, one in Hebrew the other in English, containing the results of long study both of the original text with the help o Walton's Polyglot, and the Authorised Version, o which Bishop Lowth wrote enthusiastically, 'These valuable remains of that great and good man will be of infinite service whenever that necessary work, a new translation, or a Revision of the present translation of the Holy Scriptures, for the use of ou

apart, did not call for it; and though the pedantry of that Reign is become Ridicule, and the Style intolerable: nor does such a Notion commonly appea to be founded on an Opinion of that Translation being well done, since it ha been the frequent Complaint from the Scripture-writers who understood th *Original*, of Passages rendered amiss.' Of the New Testament he remarke 'Our *present Translation* from the Greek . . . . seems worse worded tha the other Part from the *Hebrew*'; but as his list of words 'such as ar clownish, barbarous, hard,' etc., begins 'abstain, abstinence, access, abdicated etc., the modern reader will hardly think his condemnation justified. must, however, be counted for righteousness to Purver that he translated th New Testament from 'that printed by Wetsten, at Amsterdam, 1711' (s for 1751), of which more below. Compare also '*The New Testament transl ted according to the Present Idiom of the English Tongue*,' by the Rev. Joh Worsley (died 1767), published in 1770.

[1] Dr. John Taylor (of Norwich, afterwards Principal of the Warringto Academy), issued in 1751 his proposals for publishing the Hebrew Conco dance on which he had been engaged for more than thirteen years; and it appearance in 1754 gave a further impulse to Old Testament study, as served the purpose of a Lexicon as well.

Church, shall be undertaken.'[1] Kennicott, prompted by Lowth and encouraged by Secker, was at work on the collation of MSS. of the Old Testament.[2] Blayney prepared for the Clarendon Press a very careful edition of the Authorised Version, with improved punctuation and spelling, and followed Lowth's *Isaiah* with a new translation of Jeremiah. Durell, the Principal of Hertford College, Oxford, issued in 1763 a monograph of a type afterwards more familiar in Germany than in this country:[3] while in the preface to his *Critical Remarks on Job, Psalms, etc.*, 1772, he pleaded for a new translation of the Bible. Two notable essays in the last quarter of the century summed up the state of British learning on the Old Testament, the Preliminary Dissertation prefixed by Bishop Lowth to his *New Translation of Isaiah*, 1778,[4] and the *Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible, from corrected texts of the Originals, compared with the ancient Versions*, issued by the learned Scotch Roman Catholic Priest, Dr. Geddes, at Glasgow, in 1786.

[1] *Preliminary Dissertation*, prefixed to his *Isaiah*, 11th ed., 1835, p. xlviii.

[2] See his *Ten Annual Accounts*, etc.; the total sum raised in aid of his enterprise amounted to £9117 7s. 6d. He cannot repress a burst of admiration (p. 171): 'Reader! what a sum is here! Let Foreign Nations read, with astonishment, this story of *Britons* and *their* KING.'

[3] *The Hebrew Texts of the Parallel Prophecies of Jacob and Moses relating to the Twelve Tribes with a Translation and Notes, and the Various Sections of near Forty MSS.*, to which are added the Samaritan-Arabic Version of those Passages, and part of another Arabic Version made from the Samaritan Text, etc.

[4] The first of a series of renderings of the prophetical books, to which Bishop Newcombe (better known by his labours on the New Testament), contributed a version of the Minor Prophets.

Both of these distinguished scholars dwelt on the obvious corruption of the Hebrew text in many places. The Bishop pointed to errors arising from the confusion of similar letters, their accidental transposition or omission, causes of error which affected not letters only, but even words and clauses. Geddes looked for the means of correction to the various readings of Hebrew Manuscripts, to the occasional occurrence of parallel passages within the Old Testament itself,[1] to quotations made by Jewish or Christian writers; and both scholars laid great stress on the aid to be derived from the versions, while they further defended occasional recourse to conjectural emendation. These were the methods which had been applied to the classical texts, why should they be withheld from the Bible?[2]

[1] Such are, for instance, *Is.* 2^{2-4} and *Mic.* 4^{1-4}; *Ps.* 18 and 2 *Sam.* 22; 2 *Kings* 18^{13}-20 and *Is.* 36-39.

[2] This plea is urged with great force by both writers: thus Lowth says (p. xliii.) 'The copies of the Holy Scriptures being then subject, like all other ancient writings, to mistakes arising from the unskilfulness or inattention of transcribers, a plain matter of fact which cannot be denied, and needs not be palliated; it is to be considered what remedy can be applied in this case . . ? Now the case being the same, the method which has been used with good effect in correcting the ancient Greek and Latin authors ought in all reason to be applied to the Hebrew writings. At the revival of letters, critics and editors, finding the Greek and Latin authors full of mistakes, set about correcting them, by procuring different copies, and the best that they could meet with; these they compared together, and the mistakes not being the same in all, one copy corrected another; and thus they easily got rid of such errors as had not yet obtained possession in all the copies, and generally the more copies they had to compare, the more errors were corrected, and the more perfect the text was rendered.'

Similarly Geddes opens fire at once (p. 2), 'It is an assertion no less strange than true, that the text of scarcely any profane author of note has been so incorrectly published as that of the Hebrew Scriptures. To restore

There was, indeed, one grave difficulty; 'the oldest of the Hebrew MSS. now known,' said Lowth, 'does not come within many centuries of the times of the several authors, not nearer than about fourteen centuries to the age of Ezra, one of the latest of them, who is supposed to have revised the books of the Old Testament then extant, and to have reduced them to a perfect and correct standard.'

Modern scholarship does not justify this view of Ezra's critical activity; but it confirms the Bishop's lament concerning the late date of the only available manuscripts. The laborious collations of Kennicott[1]

Demosthenes, Tully, Virgil, Horace, as nearly as possible to their first integrity, no human pains have been spared; libraries have been ransacked, MSS. collated, parallel places compared, history, geography, criticism alternately called in to assistance. . . . . Why were not the same pains taken, and the same means employed, to give a correct edition of the Bible?' Geddes concludes (p. 147) with a charming vision of inter-ecclesiastical fellowship in Biblical enterprise which was to be realised a century later in this country by the Revisers (though Dr. Newman declined any share in the undertaking): 'It is from the united studies of the learned of all communions, that we can ever hope to bring the Scriptures to that degree of purity and perfection of which they are yet susceptible; and it is with infinite pleasure we perceive that the learned themselves begin to be of this sentiment. The labours of a Houbigant, a Villhoison, a Georgi, and a Rossi are as much prized at London, Leipsick and Gœttengen, as those of a Lowth, a Kennicott, and a Michaelis are at Paris, Parma, and Rome: and if the present taste for Oriental learning continue to be diffused, we may soon look for, at least, as perfect and impartial editions and translations of the Hebrew classics, as we already have of the Greek and Latin.' This could not, alas, have been written in the first half of the nineteenth century! A useful indicator of the Biblical work of this period will be found in Dr. Henry Cotton's *List of Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof in English from* 1505 *to* 1820, *Oxford*, 1821. The list in Bishop Newcome's *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations; the Expediency of revising by authority the present Translation, and the means of executing such a Revision* (Dublin, 1792), is very imperfect.

[1] His great Hebrew Bible was published in two vols., 1776-80. He had collated in all 581 MSS., but only 102 comprised the Old Testament complete.

and De Rossi[1] proved that even the most ancient copies preserved in continental synagogues or libraries were all derived from a common type; and our Revisers have since told us that 'the earliest MS. of which the age is certainly known bears date A.D. 916,' five hundred years after the oldest copies of the New Testament.

The history of the Hebrew text is, in fact, shrouded in mystery. The lack of more ancient rolls is in part explained by the synagogue rule that when a manuscript became old, it should be religiously destroyed. No decayed or mutilated copies were allowed to survive, lest the sacred Word should be in any way impaired. When the text first emerges in the oldest MSS. now extant, it bears upon its face the signs of many generations of scribal labour. It embodies the tradition of the Synagogue, known as the *Massorah*, and is consequently often described as the Massoretic text.[2] It has been already guarded for hundreds of years with the utmost care, and may be traced back to the first half of the second century of our era. Judaism was then beginning to recover from the tremendous shock caused by the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in the year 70 A.D. Its sanctuary had perished, but its Scriptures remained, and round these the national life clung with extraordinary

[1] In four vols., Parma, 1784-7. These collections were used by Boothroyd in his unpointed Bible (1810-16); by Hamilton, *Codex Criticus*, 1821; and by Dr. Samuel Davidson, *Hebrew Text of the O.T., revised from critical sources*, 1855. The edition of the Massorah by Dr. Ginsburg still awaits completion.

[2] See the Preface to the Revised Version.

vigour. Josephus might boast of the faithfulness with which his people had preserved their sacred books unchanged; but as a matter of fact there is clear evidence that in the centuries preceding the fall of the Jewish State the text was in circulation in different forms. The Samaritan Pentateuch, the Greek Version known as the Septuagint (begun about 250 B.C.), the text employed by the author of the book of Jubilees shortly before the great catastrophe, vary so widely from each other and from the present received text in certain particulars, as to show that there was no real fixity. There were, indeed, paid readers among the Temple officials, whose business it was to correct errors in the Biblical scrolls; a standard text, it is believed, was deposited in the forecourt, with which all fresh copies were compared.[1] But of the character of this approved text we know nothing; nor have we any information of its fate in the general wreck. It is conjectured that differences continued until the movement for consolidating the authority of the Rabbis in the second century. Reverence for the letter of the Scriptures had now invested the text with a sacred character; the copyist was exhorted to regard his work as divine, and warned that by the omission or addition of a letter he might destroy the world. The central figure in the new process was the famous Rabbi Akiba (about 50-132 A.D.). Largely under his influence, it is believed, a single text was adopted, though on what principles the

[1] *Jewish Quarterly Review*, i. 131.

choice was made is unknown; the other recensions in due time disappeared; and for the preservation of their treasure the Massoretes (or guardians of the sacred tradition) encompassed it with such care that all known manuscripts of the Old Testament now represent but one single type.

III

The eighteenth-century criticism of the New Testament was opened, as has been already remarked, by Mill's great edition in 1707. Little had been known in this country concerning the different readings of the MSS., though they had not been unnoticed by Walton in the Greek Testament of his Polyglot in 1657,[1] or by Bishop Fell in 1675. But the 30,000 variants of Mill excited great alarm, and though his discussion of them contained many sagacious reflections, he laid down no principles by which their value could be estimated, or the vast mass adequately classified. The 'Proposals' of Bentley in 1720 were founded on two sets of material. There was in the first place the precious Alexandrine MS. of the fifth century, which had been presented to Charles I. by the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1628. This contained originally the

[1] Their disquieting effect may be seen in the opposition of Dr. John Owen, whose retirement from the Vice-Chancellorship of the University of Oxford in 1658 was followed by the publication (1659) of his treatise *Of the Divine Original, Authority, Self-evidencing Light and Power of the Scriptures.* An appendix contained 'Considerations on the Prologomena and Appendix to the late Biblia Polyglotta.' Walton replied immediately in *The Considerator Considered.*

whole of the Old and New Testaments in the Greek capital letters known as 'uncials.'[1] Bentley conceived this to be 'the oldest and best in the world.' It had of course been copied from a text still more ancient, and with the help of this and other MSS., Bentley believed that he could get back to the text current in the fourth century, say at the time of the Council of Nicea, in 325 A.D. But the Greek MSS. were not his only source. The famous Latin father, Jerome, had rendered the New Testament into Latin towards the close of the fourth century, with a faithfulness which sought even to represent the very order of the Greek words. Bentley proposed to recover this version, and use it to confirm his Greek authorities. Where they agreed, the resulting text might confidently be regarded as that current in the Church of the fourth century. His method thus involved 'the appeal from recent documents to *antiquity*,' and 'the appeal to *Greek and Latin consent*.'[2]

The project was never executed, and the leadership in New Testament studies passed for more than a century into Germany. Johann Albrecht Bengel (head of a seminary at Denkendorf, in Würtemberg) in 1734 roughly divided the documents into two great families which he designated respectively as Asiatic and African. Fresh materials were accumulated by J. J. Wetstein of Basel (who had worked for Bentley) in his edition published at Amsterdam

[1] The Old Testament now lacks ten leaves. The gaps in the New Testament are more serious: the greater part of *Matthew*, up to 25^{5}, *John* 6^{50}-8^{52}, and 2 *Cor.* 4^{13}-12^{6}.

[2] Jebb, *Bentley*, in 'English Men of Letters,' 1882, p. 166.

in 1751-2. His work speedily became known in England,[1] and was used both by Harwood and Purver. Harwood, indeed, himself prepared a Greek text, *The New Testament collated with the most approved MSS.* (1776), based on the Codex Bezae at Cambridge (D in the current notation), and the Clermont codex of the Pauline epistles, once (like D) in the possession of Beza, but since 1656 preserved in the great library (now the National Library) in Paris. The Alexandrine MS. he declared to be inferior both in age and accuracy. Like his translations, this edition was enriched with classical illustrations; it had, however, little influence at the time, and fell into neglect, though many of his readings have been justified by modern scholarship.[2]

The labours of Griesbach of Halle (1745-1812), whose edition of the Gospels appeared in 1774, supply the next important link in the chain. He carried fur-

[1] Bowyer published a Greek Text in London, 1763, in which the readings regarded by Wetstein as original were incorporated in the text.

[2] In the Prolegomena to Tischendorf's eighth edition, vol. iii. (1894), p. 248, Gregory commends it as *satis notabilis*, and states that it anticipates Lachmann in 643 passages out of 1000. Reuss cites 203 passages, in most of which his readings have won modern approval, not including others which Griesbach offered almost at the same time.—Wetstein was also used by Gilbert Wakefield (tutor at the Warrington Academy, 1779-83) in his Translation of the New Test., 1791. Wakefield only occasionally refers to 'the MSS.' or 'some MSS.' without specifying the particular codices. But he makes large use of the Oriental versions, Syriac, Coptic, etc. The waywardness of his method, however, impaired the value of his work. Thus in omitting the interpolated passage in 1 *John* 5^7, he says 'I follow precisely the Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic and Arabic translations.' Why should he ignore the fact that the words in question are found in no Greek MS. before the fourteenth century?

ther the suggestive hint of Bengel, and by arranging the various readings in groups, Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine, he became the forerunner of the modern theory of Dr. Hort. The importance of his work was recognised by an Irish prelate, Dr. Newcome, who, after holding various sees, finally became Archbishop of Armagh in 1795. Three years before, in 1792, he had pleaded the desirability of a revision of the Authorised Version; he completed his own rendering of the New Testament in 1796, adding various readings from Griesbach's first edition; and the whole work was published (though not till after his death) in 1800. A note of alarm had been already sounded. In a letter to the Bishop of Ely in 1796, Mr. George Burgess urged that the time was unsuitable for such proposals; to suggest that the Authorised Version was inaccurate was almost as bad as holding French principles; and in the curious solidarity of human affairs terror at the Revolution was employed to stop the movement for Biblical revision.[1]

Other causes contributed to retard it. The investigations of Dr. Marsh into the composition of the Gospels were denounced as dangerous. The Evangelical control of the field of religious activities was unfavourable to Biblical research. When the *Improved Version of the New Testament* (based upon Newcome's) was issued in 1808, by a

[1] In Scotland, Dr. Campbell, Professor in the Marischal College of Aberdeen, issued a *Translation of the Gospels* in 1789; and Dr. Macknight of Edinburgh followed in 1795 with *A New Literal Translation of all the Apostolic Epistles.*

'Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue by the Distribution of Books,' it excited a storm of anger and disgust. Departures from the episcopal renderings were duly registered in foot-notes; but some accidental omissions, first pointed out by a Unitarian reviewer, brought down on the Editors charges which amounted to practical dishonesty. The renderings and notes to the prologue of the Gospel according to St. John and other passages indicated at once that the editors were Unitarians;[1] and controversialists endeavoured to fix a kind of responsibility for the version on the entire denomination, in spite of the fact that within a year of its publication it was criticised with great learning and (in some cases) not a little severity by a young Unitarian divine who afterwards became eminent, Dr. Lant Carpenter.[2] In later editions many defects were corrected; the text was conformed to that of Griesbach's second edition; all variations from the received text were duly recorded; in cases of divergence from Newcome's revision, his renderings were appended also. The work was a sincere attempt (to quote the introduction),

'to supply the English reader with a more correct text of the New Testament than has yet appeared in the English language, and to give him an opportunity of comparing it with the text in

[1] At their head was the Rev. Thomas Belsham, then minister of Essex Street Chapel, London.

[2] In a series of papers in the *Monthly Repository*, 1809. The *Quarterly Review*, in its second number, vehemently attacked it. The controversy was afterwards summed up by Dr. Carpenter in his *Examination of the Charges made against Unitarians and Unitarianism, and the Improved Version, by the Right Rev. Dr. Magee*, etc., 1820.

common use. Also, by divesting the sacred volume of the technical phrases of a systematic theology which has no foundation in the Scriptures themselves, to render the New Testament more generally intelligible, or at least to preclude many sources of error.'

The curious reader who will compare the passages in which such terms as 'atonement,' 'damnation,' 'damnable,' 'damned,' 'baptise in the name,' etc., are employed, will note many anticipations of changes effected by the Revisers; in some controversial texts (such as I Tim. 3^{16}, I John 3^{16}, Acts 20^{28}, Rom. 9^{5}, Eph. 3^{9}, Phil. 2^{10}) the reading and rendering, if not in every case adopted by the Revisers, secure recognition in their Margin; and charges of partiality which were often made in ignorance are thus stripped of their sting.[1] It was to be lamented that Newcome's version fell into discredit in the hub-bub raised by its successor; and in the general timidity which afflicted theological study in the first third of the century, nothing more was done.

A fresh departure was taken in 1831, when Lachmann, the brilliant professor of philology at Berlin, fresh from the verses of Catullus and Tibullus (1829), issued a small New Testament in Greek, in a series of classical texts. Eleven years after, in 1842, the first volume of his larger work was produced, followed in 1850 by the second. Lachmann

[1] After his very thorough examination of it, Dr. Carpenter could still say (*Discourses on the Genuineness, Integrity, and Public Version of the N.T.*, p. 44) that he thought it on the whole 'the most intelligible and correct English Version which had yet been laid before the public.' Cp. Rev. Alx. Gordon, *Christian Doctrine in the Light of N.T. Revision*, p. 46.

regarded himself as the successor of Bentley, but the problem of the restoration of the earliest text had become much more complicated through the discovery of fresh material. Compared with the work of his predecessors, however, Lachmann's method had one immense merit. Wetstein had still *printed* the received text of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, though he noted by signs words or clauses which he did not think original. Even Griesbach had used it as his basis, and had only ventured to correct it, though his corrections had been numerous. But Lachmann constructed his text directly from the most ancient authorities. Instead of endeavouring to overwhelm the older evidence by the mere numbers of later witnesses, he carefully selected the manuscripts which were recognised as the earliest in both Greek and Latin, and added to them the quotations in the writings of two of the most eminent Christian writers, Irenæus (a native of Asia Minor, bishop of Lyons, 177 A.D.[1]) and Origen (of Alexandria, 185-253.) On this foundation he believed it possible to restore the text of the fourth century as a foundation for further research. But subsequent investigation proved that his basis was too narrow. In limiting himself to a select group of what are known as primary uncials, he ignored the fact that later manuscripts written in the running hand of the tenth century, for instance, (hence called 'cursives'), might be trustworthy copies of much older documents. And he took no

[1] Only portions of his work survive in Greek.

note of the eastern versions, which have since been explored with much greater care and most important results.

Just before the appearance of the first volume of Lachmann's larger edition in 1842, another distinguished German scholar, Constantine Tischendorf (Professor at Leipzig, 1845-74) entered the field. For a whole generation he laboured with unwearied devotion, examining libraries, collecting manuscripts, making new and more careful collations, and producing no less than eight successive editions. His greatest achievement was the discovery of the famous MS. at Mount Sinai. On his first visit to the East, in 1844, he secured forty-three leaves, which were published in 1846 and named after Frederick Augustus, king of Saxony. His third journey in 1859 was supported by the influence of the Russian Government, and the monks of the convent of St. Catharine were induced to present their precious treasure to the Czar. In the long series of his activities fluctuations of opinion were inevitable, as fresh materials—largely through his own energy —were brought to light. Whatever may be thought of his particular judgments, the critical 'apparatus' (or summary of readings) in his last great edition (1869 and 1872) will long remain a noble monument of zeal and research.

While these two great scholars were at work in Germany, followed by a whole host of commentators and students of history, attention was slowly being awakened in this country. The

Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, Dr. Scholefield, issued some *Hints for an improved Translation of the New Testament* in 1832, but they fell almost unheeded.[1] Mr. Granville Penn published in 1836 *the Book of the New Covenant of our Lord,* basing his revision of the text chiefly on the Vatican MS. known as B.[2] From Manchester College, then domiciled at York, its learned Principal, the Rev. C. Wellbeloved, sent out the first volume of a new translation of the Old Testament, containing the Pentateuch, Proverbs, etc. (1838).[3] Following the excellent lay precedent of Mr. Penn, two well known Unitarian laymen, Mr. Samuel Sharpe, nephew of the poet Rogers, banker, and student of Egyptology,

[1] Bishop Short, in his *History of the Church of England* (first published in 1832 when he was Rector of Kings Worthy) stated the case succinctly, ii. p. 77: 'Above two hundred years have now elapsed since this review of the Bible [the Authorised Version of 1611]; and the church has subsequently contented itself with discovering inaccuracies without attempting to correct them. The whole question of a new translation is one of considerable delicacy; but the opinion of Archbishop Newcome, supported as it is by the concurrent testimony of nearly thirty divines of considerable weight, together with his own judicious remarks, which was given to the world almost forty years ago, ought not to have remained without due and public attention. If prudential reasons forbid the publication of a new version, yet surely there could be no danger in the correction of such mistakes as are obvious to all men, (for some passages are scarcely intelligible,) and of such as are acknowledged by all who are acquainted with the original languages. These amendments might be introduced into the margin, and sanctioned by authority, so that they might be used at the discretion of the minister; a step which would at least prepare the way for their ultimate introduction into the text, and show a wish to make use of the growing knowledge of the country, for the improvement of the services of the church.'

[2] This was republished in 1887.

[3] Completed in 1859 by the Revs. J. Scott Porter and G. Vance Smith (afterwards one of the New Testament Revisers).

and Mr. Edgar Taylor, grandson of Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, independently produced translations of Griesbach's text in 1840. Mr. Taylor's version (which he did not live to carry through the press) had much grace and fine tact, but it fell into undeserved obscurity. Mr. Sharpe's work passed through a series of editions, and was afterwards supplemented by a rendering of the Old Testament. An edition of the Authorised Version of the Bible with 20,000 emendations[1] was published in 1841 (due to Dr. Conquest,) in which the chapter headings were removed, and the poetical passages were printed in rhythmic lines.

More important labours had already been begun upon the text. Dr. Tregelles published his first specimen in 1838, and announced his intention to prepare a Greek Testament in 1844 in his edition of the Book of Revelation.[2] Scrivener began his long series of studies by a little *Supplement to the Authorised English Version of the New Testament,* in 1845. The Rev. J. Scott Porter of Belfast made an important contribution to the enlightenment of knowledge in this country by his *Principles of Textual Criticism*, 1848. It was afterwards superseded, so far as the New Testament was concerned, by Scrivener's *Introduction to the New Testament,*

[1] Drawn from a prodigious but most miscellaneous variety of ancient and modern writers. The Editor also stated that he had himself collated several passages with the Codex Vaticanus, and other rare and valuable manuscripts in the Vatican library.

[2] This great undertaking occupied nearly thirty years, the last instalment of the text being issued in 1872.

1861, which has since passed through four editions. The scheme of joint work which culminated in 1881, when the Greek text of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort appeared a few days before the Revised Version of the New Testament, was first planned in 1853, and occupied more than five and twenty years of study. Scrivener issued in the same year a collation of twenty MSS. hitherto unexamined, and five years later he produced a Greek Testament. Meanwhile, the education of opinion went steadily forward. Not only did Ellicott, Jowett, and Stanley, amend the Authorised Version, but the more popular work of Conybeare and Howson on St. Paul presented the apostolic letters in a new translation.[1] Even the Religious Tract Society published a paragraph Bible in 1853 with numerous corrections of the Authorised Version selected with care and judgment from the best commentators.[2] Prof. Selwyn, in his biography of Scholefield (1854) took occasion to urge the appointment of a suitable commission for revision. The *Edinburgh Review* (Oct. 1855) actually made the startling suggestion that a permanent commission should be nominated by the Crown, consisting of the most eminent Hebrew, Greek, and English scholars in the Kingdom. To them should be entrusted the important task of guarding, superintend-

[1] In 1852: its paraphrastic style was justified in the preface. p. xiii-xiv., but drew down severe condemnation from Ellicott, *Galatians* (1854), p. xx.

[2] Blackader's edition begun in 1853 also deserves mention; it professed to contain 'the most remarkable variations of the ancient versions, and the chief results of modern criticism.' His New Testament (1856-8) exhibited all the passages of the Received Text not found in the Vatican MS. in special type.

ing, and perfecting the text of the sacred writings; and they should issue from time to time, and at no long intervals, improved editions of the Hebrew, Greek, and English Scriptures.[1]

In 1856 more practical proposals were made by Canon Selwyn in the Convocation of Canterbury (Feb. 1), and Mr. James Heywood in the House of Commons (July 22), for an Address to the Crown praying for a Royal Commission. Neither effort was successful. On behalf of the Government Sir George Grey contended that such a step would not be supported by public opinion, and declared that 'the adoption of Mr. Heywood's motion would tend to unsettle the faith of the people, and lessen the respect which they entertained for the great body of the inspired writings.' Concerning the Parliamentary discussion, Lord Shaftesbury recorded a curiously confused argument in his Diary.[2] The great majority of the world, he urged, would be to the end of time dependent altogether on versions and translations. They could never have even a moderate, certainly not a critical, knowledge of the original languages. Their resource in the perplexity that a variety of versions would create, would be to go to some learned pundit in whose judgment they reposed confidence, and ask him which of the versions he would recommend, and when he had given an opinion they would feel obliged to abide by it, as they could not exercise an opinion of their own. The result of this would be to destroy not the right

[1] Vol. cii., p. 434. [2] *Life*, iii. 258.

but the exercise of private judgment, 'that grand sacred solemn principle which is the right of every man, and the great security of churches and of nations, and of the life and soul of individuals.' From another point of view Lord Panmure solemnly asserted at a public meeting in Edinburgh (Jan. 10, 1857), 'The project of a new version is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant liberties of this country, if not to the Protestant religion itself.'[1] Even so eminent a scholar as Dr. Trench, then Dean of Westminster, pleaded (1858) that for a great multitude of readers the English version was not the translation of an inspired book, but was itself the inspired book; they had never realised the fact that the divine utterance was not made at first in those very English words which they read in their cottages and heard in church.[2] The danger of disturbance to faith apparently outweighed for such timid champions all obligations to truth. A single generation has happily wiped out from its thought these unworthy fears.[3] There were other voices even in that day which gravely demanded a recognition of facts however unwelcome. A discussion at a meeting of a clerical club in London (May 7, 1856) led five Anglican clergyman to make some experiments in revision, among them being Henry

[1] Eadie, *The English Bible*, 1876, ii. 354.

[2] *On the Authorised Version of the N.T., in connexion with some recent Proposals for its Revision*, p. 134.

[3] The language of Dr. Trench was in most unfavourable contrast with the earnest reasoning of the late Dr. J. R. Beard (1857) in his vigorous little treatise *A Revised English Bible the Want of the Age.*

Alford, already at work on the fourth volume of his Greek Testament, and soon to be appointed Dean of Canterbury.[1] They issued (1857-58) a new version of the Gospel according to St. John, and of the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. One of their number, the Rev. C. J. Ellicott, who still happily presides over the diocese of Gloucester, described the situation in impassioned words in the preface to his edition of *The Pastoral Epistles* (1856, p. xiii.)[2]:—

'It is vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors in the Authorised Version are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there are misconceptions, there are obscurities; and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable Word of God.'

IV.

The controversies roused by the publication of *Essays and Reviews* and of the first part of the treatise on the Pentateuch by Dr. Colenso did not

[1] The others were the Revs. Dr. Barrow (Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford), C. J. Ellicott, W. G. Humphry, and Dr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury. See *Life of Dean Alford*, 1873, pp. 262-4, and Dr. Ellicott's *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture*, 1901, pp. 12-14.

[2] With Dr. Ellicott's name it is natural to couple that of Dr. Lightfoot, whose first work on St. Paul, the *Epistle to the Galatians*, did not, however, appear till 1865. It contained his own reconstruction of the text, but no translation.

directly touch the question of Revision. But indirectly they helped to prepare the way; and the judgment of the Privy Council, by removing all restraints from Biblical investigation, powerfully promoted the general movement. As soon as the change had been effected in the terms of clerical subscription, attention was more and more carefully directed to the need of a fresh version of the Scriptures, and above all, to a fresh text of the New Testament. A generation had passed since Lachmann had first applied a new method of critical enquiry. Rich stores of additional material had been brought to light, and various eminent scholars had devoted themselves to the establishment of definite principles for their use in the reconstruction of the ancient text. By 1870, accordingly, the time was ripe, though Mr. Gladstone confessed to a little shock of surprise when the subject was brought before him. The first impulse proceeded from a representative of what was then known as the Broad Church, Mr. Charles Buxton, who gave notice of a question on the matter in the House of Commons. It was to come on in March, but he was adroitly forestalled. The Bishop of Winchester, with the ready insight of a shrewd ecclesiastical politician, at once moved in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury (Feb. 10) a resolution for the appointment of a joint Committee of both Houses (who should confer with any Committee that might be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province), to report on the desirableness of a

revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament. This was seconded by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. On the proposal of the Bishops of Llandaff and St. David's its scope was enlarged to include the Old Testament also, and it was in due course adopted by both Houses. The Northern Convocation, however, declined to take any action.

In the meantime Bishop Wilberforce, who had really been prompted by Bishop Ellicott and Dean Alford, put himself in communication with the Premier. The first idea, apparently, was that the work should be accomplished by a Commission appointed under the Crown. Writing to the Bishop of Winchester, however, on Feb. 21, relative to Mr. Buxton's approaching question, Mr. Gladstone emphatically rejected the suggestion:[1] 'I must own myself totally at a loss to see how the preliminary difficulty of composing the Commission, if a Crown Commission, could be surmounted.' To Lord Shaftesbury, on the same day, he explained his position in the following terms[2]:—

'Some short time back the Bishop of Winchester and Gloucester referred to me on the same subject. I was rather startled by the enquiry. I answered, however, that no pledge could be given by me on the part of the Government, that I did not think they would be disposed to stand in the way of a general desire, but neither would they, I thought, be responsible for any initiative in starting the question, or be disposed to take it up as a contested one.

[1] *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, vol. iii. (1882), p. 348.

[2] Printed in the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 348.

'This was from an official point of view. Speaking as an individual, I may add that the more I think upon the subject, the more I am impressed with the difficulty of any interference by authority either for the purpose of settling a Greek text, or for the purpose of altering the present version of Holy Scripture. To all private labourers with a view to either purpose I give a hearty sympathy; and such labours may render possible hereafter what I cannot see my way to now.'

On the following day (Feb. 22) the Bishop of Winchester wrote to Mr. Gladstone indicating the scope of his own view of the enterprise[1]:

'Of course I was not privy to Buxton's notice. But the knowledge *before I moved* that the Broad party were about to move, convinced me of the wisdom of *our* moving and having the matter in our hands. C. Buxton's question is one of the troublesome movements I expected. My own impression is that it will be best to keep the *text* unaltered, and put any corrections into the margin. Thence by slow degrees they may migrate into the text. I would not give up our translation for anything—nor have I the faintest idea of the Bishop of St. Davids' vision of a final, once for all, revision. The only need at last for State authority will be for the Queen's printers to be allowed to print what the Church has adopted as the Authorised Version.'

The movement thus arose in its actual form out of the astute resolve of the Bishop of Winchester to secure for the Church the control which Mr. Buxton and his friends were willing really to entrust to Parliament. But it went much further than the Bishop proposed. On May 3 and 5, before the joint Committee of the two Houses presented their report, the two Houses separately adopted resolutions affirming (1) that it was desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version should be undertaken, and

[1] *Life*, vol. iii. p. 350.

(2) that it should comprise not only marginal renderings, but also such emendations as it might be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version. The report of the joint Committee was at the same time accepted, and on May 3 the Upper House proceeded to nominate its own members for another joint Committee to carry out the revision, expressly providing 'that the Committee be empowered to invite the co-operation of those whom they may judge fit from their biblical scholarship to aid them in their work.'[1] This wise and generous arrangement, due (as Dean Stanley afterwards stated) to the Bishop of Winchester, was also adopted by the Lower House. The Revision Committee, thus constituted, proceeded to invite experts, and to form two companies, one for the Old Testament and the other for the New,[2] the first comprising twenty-seven members, and the second twenty-six. They all, however, belonged to the United Kingdom. Co-operation with continental scholars would have involved many difficulties, but an American revision was organised, and the results of the fellow-labourers on each side of the Atlantic were duly interchanged.

The labours of the two English companies began on June 22, 1870. The New Testament occupied 407 days, the devoted Chairman, the Bishop of Gloucester, being present on no less than 405. Six years were devoted to the first revision; two years

[1] A previous resolution, adopted by both Houses, even added 'to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.'

[2] The names of the members are recorded by Bishop Ellicott, *Addresses on the Revised Version*, pp. 26, 27.

and a half to the second. The work was completed in 1880, and issued in 1881. More time was required for the Old Testament, though by no means in proportion to its greater bulk, the revision requiring 792 days. It was completed after fourteen years in 1884, and published in 1885.[1]

V.

What was the task which lay before the Revisers in the light of the knowledge of a generation ago? A few words must be said (for the sake of brevity they are limited to the New Testament) concerning the two-fold problem, (1) the correction of the translation of the Authorised Version, and (2) the reconstruction of the text.

In the first place the whole conception of the translator's duty had become much more exact. The progress of scholarship in two hundred and fifty years rendered some of the loose and shifty ways of the Authorised Version no longer tolerable. For instance, the statement of *Gen.* 15^6 in its Greek form, '*it was reckoned to* him for righteousness,' appeared in the following variations of the same original:—

Rom. 4^3 'It was *counted unto* him for righteousness';
Rom. 4^9 'We say that faith *was reckoned* to Abraham for righteousness';

[1] The revision of the Apocrypha appeared in 1895: and on Feb. 10, 1899, the Bishop of Gloucester presented to both Houses of Convocation 'the completed body of references, and, in them, the very last portion of every part of the work of the Company with which I had so long been connected,' *Addresses*, p. 43.

Rom. 4^{22} 'It was *imputed unto* him for righteousness';
Gal. 3^{6} 'It was *accounted to* him for righteousness';
James 2^{23} 'It was *imputed to* him for righteousness';

No difference of meaning, it may be urged, was caused by these irregularities. Nevertheless, a wholesome rule of modern scholarship, requiring that the same Greek word in the same context should be rendered by the same English equivalent, was grossly infringed. The Translators of 1611, indeed, were quite aware that they had exposed themselves to this reproach; 'we have not tied ourselves,' they declared, 'to an uniformity of phrasing'; 'is the kingdom of God,' they asked, 'become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free?' But this liberty led sometimes to unforeseen consequences. There seemed no reason why the Paraclete who was an 'Advocate' in *I John* 2^{1} should become a 'Comforter' in *John* $14^{16\ 26}$ 15^{26} 16^{7}; at any rate, an important fact of theological nomenclature was obscured.[1] In the same way there was no real distinction between 'everlasting' applied to punishment, and 'eternal' applied to life, in *Matt.* 25^{46}, though some modern disputants might have founded an argument upon it; the Greek 'æonian' stood for both. But when *Mark* 15^{33} stated that at the crucifixion there was darkness 'over the whole land,' while *Luke* 23^{44} (using the same Greek) was made to extend it 'over all the

[1] Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. 1872, maintains that the word 'Paraclete' in itself means 'Advocate,' and cannot mean 'Comforter.' The Improved Version has 'advocate' throughout.

earth,' a very serious discrepancy was involved.[1] Conversely, different Greek words were rendered by the same English. *Hades*, as the abode of departed spirits, and *Gehenna*, the place of penal doom, were both translated by 'hell,' with mischievous results (for instance) in *Acts* 2^{31}. The well-known distinction of Greek philosophical thought between 'being' and 'becoming' was wholly effaced in the rendering *John* 8^{5} 'Before Abraham was, I am.'[2]

These two groups of errors had become intolerable to minds imbued with the modern principles of fidelity to all the peculiarities of an author's diction. The first, in particular, again and again obscured the intricate relations of the corresponding passages in the Gospels, by destroying the identities of phraseology for the sake of a useless assertion of freedom from bondage to the letter. But the same demand for faithfulness might be almost indefinitely extended. It would affect the whole tissue of the language. The usages of New Testament Greek were undoubtedly far better understood than was possible before its relations to the Greek of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, the Greek of secular writers earlier and later, and the Greek of common speech in its own age, had been carefully studied. The use of the article, the significance of special conjunctions, the force of tenses, the meaning of prepositions,—all these required a constant and careful attention such as the translators of 1611 had failed

[1] The Margin, however, gave an alternative, 'or, land.'

[2] R.V. margin, 'Gr. *was born*;' so the Improved Version.

to bestow, because they had never realised its need. For example, the preposition *dia* with the genitive which denotes instrumentality, was repeatedly translated 'by' as if it denoted direct agency. Thus in *Matt.* 1^{22} 'spoken of the Lord by the prophet' does not mean 'spoken about Jesus by Isaiah,' but 'spoken by the Lord (*i.e.* the Yahweh of the Old Testament) through the prophet' as his messenger. Similarly, numerous passages appear to ascribe creative operations to Christ as their source, which are really said to be done 'through' him (*e.g. John* $1^{3\ 10}$, *I Cor.* 8^{6}, *Col.* 1^{16}, *Hebr.* 1^{2} 2^{10}); while in *John* 1^{17} just as the law was given 'through' Moses, so grace and truth came 'through' Jesus Christ. Nor do these grammatical errors by any means exhaust the defects of the Authorised Version. Wrong meanings were sometimes assigned to words through ignorance of their use or derivation, or through neglect of some special application, as when the term *pais* is rendered 'thy servant' of David, *Acts* 4^{25}, but 'thy [holy] child' of Jesus in $^{27\text{-}30}$ (cp. $3^{13\ 26}$); though in *Matt.* 12^{18} the connexion with the 'servant of the Lord' in *Isaiah* 42^{1} was duly recognised. That metaphors should be confused, that titles should be misrepresented, that technical terms should be imperfectly understood, was inevitable in 1611; but the modern scholar, with the archæologist by his side, could no longer be content with blemishes which might not indeed affect the presentation of religious truth, but nevertheless seriously disfigured the historic record.

More difficult in many ways was the preliminary duty which devolved on the Revisers, that of correcting not the translation but the original text. Three great writers had devoted themselves to this task during the generation which preceded the Revision, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. But it was well known also that two of the most eminent of living Biblical scholars had been engaged for many years on a similar enterprise; Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort were of course both members of the New Testament company; instalments of their text had been furnished for the use of their colleagues; and their famous edition (known as W H) was produced a few days before the Revised Version appeared. The second volume contained an Introduction written by Dr. Hort, setting forth the principles which had guided the editors. Like their immediate predecessors Tischendorf and Tregelles, they believed it possible to do more than reach the fourth century text at which Lachmann aimed; they sought to recover, at least approximately, what the Apostles and Evangelists themselves had written.

The total number of manuscripts of the books of the New Testament is now reckoned at about 3000. But only a small proportion, about thirty in all, are complete. The Sinaitic MS. is the only uncial which shows no gaps. Some copies which doubtless once contained the entire canon have suffered the loss of some of their leaves; others only comprised portions of the whole collection, such as the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, or the book

of Revelation. The earliest may be traced back to the fourth and fifth centuries, but the greater part date from the ninth century or later. What use could be made of this vast mass of materials? And what light was thrown upon their variations by comparison with each other, and with the versions early made for the several branches of the Church, or with the quotations of important passages by writers in different countries between the second and fifth centuries? No previous editors devoted such long and anxious consideration to these problems. In the eighteenth century Griesbach, following a hint of Bengel (*ante*, p. 61),had defined the existence of families or groups of manuscripts. Dr. Hort was led, after many years of study ranging over the whole field of early Christian history and literature, to formulate an important theory as to the genealogy of the different forms of the text represented in the oldest copies.[1]

In the fourth century the Christian Church had spread far and wide through the Roman Empire. In the East it had long included the Syriac-speaking people in the upper valley of the Euphrates; on the South it was carried from Egypt into Ethiopia; North of the Danube, through the labours of Ulfilas, it touched the Goths. So the New Testament has come down to us not only in Greek, the language in

[1] This theory was expounded (with much compression both of statement and of evidence) in the separate volume of *Introduction*. Summaries of it will be found in Kenyon's useful treatise, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*, 3rd ed., 1898, pp. 107-12, and in the *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. pp. 244-51. The following outline is only intended for the general reader.

which its books were first written, but also in the Latin of Italy, in the Syriac of Edessa and its neighbourhood, the Coptic dialects of Egypt, the Ethiopic of Abyssinia, the Gothic of the warlike tribes which made their way across the Alps and into Spain, and even in Armenian from the regions of Ararat. Behind all these translations, themselves of very various ages, lay Greek texts, of which two are extant from the fourth century, the Vatican MS. at Rome (B), and the Sinaitic at St. Petersburg (ℵ); while two more, the Alexandrian (A), in the British Museum, and the Codex of Ephraem (C) in the National Library at Paris, date from the fifth. Fragments of twenty-seven manuscripts are assigned to the sixth century; but in only five of these is there even one single book complete. To this age belongs the famous copy (D) once in the possession of Beza, and now preserved at Cambridge, in both Greek and Latin, distinguished by many peculiarities of text, especially by its interpolations. It once extended over 534 leaves, but 128 have perished.

What was the pedigree of all these texts? From what sources were they derived? How were they related to each other, and how were their discrepancies to be explained? The peculiarities of each copy required careful study. Its affinities with other copies could then be determined. These in their turn might be compared with the indications derived from the versions current in separate localities, or the writings of eminent Christian teachers in the great centres of influence such as Antioch or

Constantinople, Cæsarea or Alexandria, Carthage or Rome. The readings gathered up out of all these several sources were distributed by Dr. Hort into three main groups, bearing geographical designations, Syrian, Alexandrian, and Western; to which he added a fourth without local habitation, and consequently called 'neutral.' But this distribution was capable of further arrangement historically. When the quotations in the writings of the fathers before the council of Nicea were compared with those in later centuries, such marked differences were observable as to suggest that the latter employed a text which had been already 'edited.' This led to a theory of revisions, the first towards the end of the third century, the second about 350 A.D., in which alternative readings were sometimes combined, and the differences between parallel passages were harmonised. Thus the last words of the third Gospel in the Received Text are 'praising and blessing God.'[1] This is found in A, in twelve later uncials, all the cursives, the Vulgate and other versions. But ℵ B C, with one Egyptian (Memphitic) and one Syriac version, have only 'blessing God': while D and the Old Latin have 'praising God.'[2] Here the reading of the Received Text seems to be due to an amalgamation of two separate readings. It is more likely that variations should be run together than that one or other

[1] See Hort's *Introduction*, p. 104; Kenyon, p. 108.

[2] Lachmann, Alford, Maclellan, Tregelles, followed the Textus Receptus; Tischendorf adopted 'praising': Weiss and WH read 'blessing' (and so afterwards the RV).

should be dropped: and the evidence of the recension of the Greek text of the Old Testament in the fourth century shows that this method of editing was then actually practised at Constantinople.

Now the quotations in the homilies of the great preacher John Chrysostom (born at Antioch about 347 A.D., Bishop of Constantinople 398-404) again and again exhibit these 'conflate' readings. So do the remains of his fellow-pupil Theodore of Antioch and Mopsuestia, and their teacher Diodorus of Antioch and Tarsus. This type of text is in fact common from that time onwards, in manuscripts, quotations, and versions. Dr. Hort concluded, therefore, that it took its rise in Syria; and his 'Syrian' group, which became the foundation of the Received Text, represented the result of editorial labours on earlier stages of the documentary history. On the other hand the writings of Origen and Cyril, and occasionally other Alexandrian fathers, as well as one of the Egyptian versions (the Memphitic), bore witness to a group of readings earlier than the Syrian, and at least as old as the opening of the third century. They were marked by linguistic correctness, and their distinction lay in their style rather than their matter. To these was naturally given the local designation 'Alexandrian.' The 'Western' group comprised the Græco-Latin MSS., such as the Codex Bezae, which were written in the West, and the Old Latin version once diffused from Carthage to Britain. In these were embodied forms of a text which was probably carried very early to

Rome from the East. It is distinguished by a love of paraphrase, and a tendency to incorporate additions which may have been current orally, or may have been derived from apocryphal and other non-biblical sources. Lastly comes the text which is not noteworthy for any of the peculiarities of the three preceding groups. It shows neither the Western diffuseness, nor the grammatical refinement of the specifically Alexandrian, and is accordingly designated as 'neutral.' It belongs to no special centre of influence; it was originally current through the East; and among individual MSS. it is best represented by the Vatican. The concurrence of the Vatican and the Sinaitic was almost final. To recover and justify this text was the main object of the labours of Westcott and Hort.[1]

VI.

Such was the preparation for the Revised Version. The publication of the New Testament had been awaited with an interest perhaps somewhat exaggerated and overstrained. The immediate effect was disappointment to some, and sorrow or dismay to others. Those who learned that the changes in the text, the translation, and the punc-

[1] It was estimated by Dr. Hort that 'the amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text.' 'This would mean,' says Mr. H. W. Hoare (*The Evolution of the English Bible*, 2nd ed. 1902, p. 281), 'less than 200 words in the entire New Testament.'

tuation, reached the surprising number of 36,191, were shocked at an amount of alteration the need of which they did not understand. The student who perceived how often the reading or the rendering which commended itself to his judgment was only to be found in the margin, lamented the conservative instinct which had too frequently opposed salutary change. The condemnation of the supporters of traditional scholarship was expressed in the vigorous articles of Dean Burgon in the *Quarterly Review;* and many a devout but ignorant layman sympathised with Lord Shaftesbury's somewhat contemptuous repudiation,—'The result shows clearly that it was not wanted, and is not cared for. It is of no use to the unlearned masses, to the learned few it is insufficient.' Familiarity has now overcome the first rush of revolt against meddling with Christendom's most sacred trreasure. The significant fact that no correction was admitted save by a majority of two to one, has gradually impressed even the most stubborn of opponents. And the representation of divergent proposals in the margin (which in numerous cases expresses the view of the actual majority of the company) often supplies evidence, as in *Rom.* 9^5, that the rendering in the text cannot be regarded as indisputably sure. But the plea of the great teacher to whom all students of the New Testament are so deeply indebted—the late Bishop of Durham—is not lightly to be set aside :—

'The text represents the united and deliberate judgment of a larger and more varied body of scholars than has ever on any

other occasion discussed together a version of the New Testament into another language.'[1]

The reception of the Old Testament four years later (in 1885) was less disturbed by conflict of opinion. The theological issues involved in it were not so prominent; the changes were in many parts less frequent, and hence less noticeable; and few portions of it (except the Book of Psalms, where the wide differences between the Prayer-book and the Authorised Version far exceeded those between the Authorised and Revised) were so familiar to the reader as his gospels or epistles, so that alterations were less marked, and therefore less irritating. A longer interval is needed to register a final judgment, but (without attempting any criticism of detail) some of the gains of the revision may be briefly noted.

Great attention was bestowed on the external presentation of the new version. It was wisely resolved to let it speak for itself, and accordingly the entire series of chapter headings, involving again and again a very important system of interpretation, has been removed.[2] The poetry of the Song of Solomon is no longer said to express 'the mutual love of Christ and his Church'; and the wedding ode in Psalm 45 ceases to describe 'the majesty and grace of Christ's kingdom.' The prophetic utterances may now be read in connexion with the events of their time, and no barrier is put in the way

[1] *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the N.T.*, 3rd ed., 1898, p. 18.

[2] So, also, the misleading chronology of Archbishop Ussher has been quietly dropped.

of their proper historic meaning. This is further promoted by the arrangement of the text in paragraphs, reverting to the usage of the earliest English versions, so that the pauses of prophetic discourse, or the sequences of apostolic argument, can be recognised more clearly. Thus *Isaiah* 9^{1-7} is now rightly joined to the previous passage; and in 9^{8-21} 10^{1-4} the reader at once discerns a poetical oracle in four stanzas each terminating with a common refrain; while at 10^{5} a new address opens against the Assyrian, separated probably by many years from its predecessor. The poetical style of the Psalms, the Proverbs, and other portions of the Old Testament (as in the ancient poems in *Judges* 5, *Gen.* 49, *Deut.* 33, etc.), is indicated by the display of each verse in its constituent lines, and a similar method has been sparingly employed in the New. It might be extended with considerable advantage to many passages in the first three Gospels, where the teaching of Jesus is thrown into partially rhythmic forms.[1] In the New Testament the titles of the books have been retained, with the lame apology that they were not expressly included in the Revision. This involves the continued ascription of *Hebrews* to the Apostle Paul, which no scholar of eminence believes,[2] in spite of the fact that the oldest MSS., whose readings are elsewhere always regarded as decisive against the Textus Receptus, simply entitle

[1] This was actually done, following the hints of Bishops Lowth and Jebb, in Blackader's New Test., 1856. On the general subject, cp. the papers of Dr. C. A. Briggs in the *Expository Times*, vol. viii. pp. 393, 452, 492; vol. ix. p. 69.

[2] See the articles in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, and *Encycl. Biblica*.

it 'To the Hebrews.'[1] With much greater wisdom did the Revisers of the Old Testament follow the Hebrew text, and replace the 'Song of Solomon' by the 'Song of Songs.'[2]

In the changes of the text a marked difference is to be noted between the treatment of the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New. The Revisers frankly recognised the facts that the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Scriptures was embodied in MSS. that are of no very great antiquity, and that the variations of the Versions show that other and older recensions once existed. But they did not feel that the present state of knowledge would justify an attempt to reconstruct the text on the authority of the Versions. That was no doubt a safe decision. We are still waiting for a complete edition of the oldest and most important of the Versions, the Greek text of the Septuagint; and stores of other material are only imperfectly accessible. But the Massoretic text is in many places obviously corrupt, and impossible to translate. This has been widely recognised by the commentators and editors of the last twenty years, and a vast amount of labour has been bestowed on the amendment of the text.[3] The task is no doubt often of extraordinary difficulty; it is possible

[1] It is not surprising that the American Committee protested.

[2] This form of expression, like 'heaven of heavens,' 'servant of servants,' is a well-known Hebrew mode of indicating the superlative.

[3] See Haupt's polychrome *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*; the O.T. vols. in the *International Critical Commentary*; the German series in the *Handkommentar* and *Hand-Commentar*, and single treatises such as Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*.

that it may not even after another century of toil be found practicable to obtain a sufficient consensus of opinion for any company of scholars to carry it through. But it is perhaps unfortunate that the Revisers have so rarely admitted that the existing Hebrew is no longer intelligible, and have insisted on finding a meaning where grammar and sense both fail. In other cases it is lawful to regret that a two-thirds' majority could not be obtained for the marginal rendering, as in *Psalm* 42^{5} 'who is the health of my countenance and my God,' a refrain identical with that in ver. ^{11} and in 43^{5}, the poem consisting of three stanzas.[1] This is supported by the Greek, Syriac, and Latin versions, and requires no alteration of the letters of the text, but only a re-division of the words affecting one single letter. In this, as in many other cases, the conservative method of the Revisers seems to have prevented justifiable change.

Very different was the treatment of the Greek text of the New Testament. The vast mass of critical materials which had been gathered by recent editors, the repeated discussion of the principles of selection in the literature of the century, and the development in this country of somewhat divergent views in the persons of Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Hort, gave the Revisers a unique opportunity, of which they courageously availed themselves.[2] It is esti-

[1] *Psalms* 42 and 43 are rightly treated as one composition, just as *Pss.* 19, 24, 27, etc., are divided.

[2] The remark of Hort's biographer, *Life*, ii. 238, that the presence of the two Cambridge Professors (Westcott and Hort) 'secured the maintenance of the principle that questions of reading must be decided on their

mated that the text of the Revisers differs from that of 1611 in 5788 readings, though only about one-fourth of these involve any real modification of the subject matter, and a much smaller proportion are of first-rate importance. The omission of the doxology to the Lord's Prayer in *Matt.* 6^{13} (note also the silent disappearance of 'openly' at the end of [4] and [6]), the recognition that *Mark* $16^{9\text{-}20}$ was not the original close to the Gospel, the version of the Lord's Prayer in *Luke* $11^{2\text{-}4}$, the marginal notes on *Luke* 9^{55}, $22^{19\text{-}20}$ $^{43\text{-}44}$, 23^{34}, 24^{12} ^{36} ^{40} ^{51} ^{52}, *John* 5^{4}, 7^{53}-8^{11}, illustrating the manner by which additions were made to the Gospel story, the quiet extrusion of *1 John* 5^{7}, the changes in controversial passages like *1 Tim.* 3^{16} or *Ephes.* 3^{9},—are familiar instances of the frank recognition of critical facts. The charge has, indeed, been recently revived by Provost Salmon that the Revisers were unduly influenced by two of their number, Drs. Westcott and Hort. The Bishop of Gloucester, who, as Chairman of the Company (and present at 405 out of 407 meetings), had an unrivalled knowledge of its proceedings, has been at some pains to refute it:[1] the evidence for the readings 'was always fully stated to the Company, nearly always by Dr. Scrivener, and it was

own merits, irrespectively of questions of interpretation,' appears to convey an unnecessary imputation against the fidelity of the rest of the company. The danger that anybody would follow John Selden's advice was surely past: 'When you meet with several Readings of the Text, take heed that you admit nothing against the tenets of your Church; but do as if you was a-going over a Bridge, be sure you hold fast by the Rail, and then you may dance here and there as you please' (*Table Talk*, 'Bible,' § 13).

[1] *Addresses*, pp. 56-64.

upon the discussion of this evidence, and not on the reading of any particular editor, that the decision of the Company was ultimately found.' Dr. Scrivener, we are assured (as those familiar with his judgments might surmise), often took a very different view of the critical evidence from that of Westcott and Hort, 'and never failed very fully, and often very persuasively, to express it.' Those must, indeed, have been hours of education in the Jerusalem Chamber, when the 'critical duel' between Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Hort was waged with all the resources of learning and skill. Out of the total changes, it is believed that there are only 64 passages in the whole New Testament where the Revisers' text agrees with that of Westcott and Hort unsupported by either Lachmann, Tischendorf, or Tregelles. Dr. Ellicott, indeed, declares his deliberate conviction[1] that it is 'one of the two best texts of the New Testament at present extant,' the other being that of Prof. Nestle (3rd ed., Stuttgart, 1901). With hardly less emphasis, and with perhaps even weightier judgment, does the Bishop of Durham say[2]:—

'No part of the work of the Revisers has been more violently or unintelligently attacked than their revision of the Greek text: no part of their work will commend itself, I believe, more completely to scholars at least of the next generation.'

The justification of such an achievement as the

[1] *Addresses*, p. 63.

[2] *Some Lessons of the Revised Version*, p. 208. The Greek text of the Revisers was published by Archdeacon Palmer (Oxford, 1882); and at Cambridge Dr. Scrivener issued a volume containing the text underlying the Authorised Version with the Revisers' variants in foot-notes.

Revision of the Bible must be left to time. It is easy for any single critic to point to passages where he desires a different reading or another translation. In the New Testament, in particular, the Revisers have occasionally been swayed by ecclesiastical usage in defiance of principles of uniformity, as in the frequent retention of Holy Ghost for Holy Spirit (against which the American Company protested), or by regard for devout sentiment as in the translation of Paraclete by 'Comforter' in one set of passages and 'Advocate' in another. But on the other hand, in numerous cases uniformity of rendering has been secured with great advantage, especially in quotations (*e.g.* *Rom.* 12^{19} and *Hebr.* 10^{30}), and in parallel passages in the Gospels, or in antithetic expressions such as *Matt.* 23^{12} (cp. *Luke* 14^{11}, 18^{14}). Conversely, care has been taken not to confound the different ideas of Hades and Gehenna in a common 'hell'; in the Old Testament, however, the treatment of Sheol is far from satisfactory, though the margin usually enables the student to avoid serious error.[1] Other words which have played a considerable part in older theologies, such as 'predestination,' 'atonement,' 'infidel,' 'damnation,' have been replaced by terms with less definite symbolic import. The desire for grammatical accuracy has led to a considerable number of small changes. The significance of tenses has been far better understood, especially

[1] The American Company advised the retention of the ancient name, so as to leave the determination of its scope in any special passage to the reader.

in the Old Testament (compare such different instances as *Jer.* 20^{7-10} and *Isaiah* 63^{1-6}), entire passages in the prophetic books suddenly becoming instinct with vigour out of confusion and obscurity. A new sense of Hebrew style pervades the description of the miner's toil at the opening of *Job* 28; or (though the changes are fewer) the dramatic sequences of the second Psalm (in spite of the unsatisfactory 'kiss the son' in ^{12}). Similarly in the New Testament the distinction between the imperfect, the aorist, and the perfect, has been again and again emphasised with advantage; peculiarities in the use of the article have been noted (though many ambiguities still remain); and special attention has been given to the rendering of prepositions. The change from 'in' to 'into the name' in *Matt.* 28^{19} removes from the conception of baptism a suspicion of magical efficacy;[1] the divine forgiveness is no longer bestowed for Christ's sake, *Ephes* 4^{32}.[2] Needless glosses cease to perplex the reader, as in *1 John* 3^{16}. Archaisms have been removed, though some still remain like the 'chapiters' of Solomon's pillars. The renderings of technical terms of natural history (the 'unicorns' have

[1] On the question of the original form of this text, the reader should consult the remarkable article of Mr. F. C. Conybeare in the *Hibbert Journal*, No. 1, Oct., 1902.

[2] So keenly did the venerable Bishop of Durham feel the significance of the two prepositions now rendered '*into* the name' *Matt.* 28^{19}, and '*in* Christ' *Rom.* 6^{23}, that he could write, 'Certainly I would gladly have given the ten years of my life spent on the Revision to bring only these two phrases of the New Testament to the hearts of Englishmen' (*Some Lessons of the Revised Version*, p. 63).

happily vanished), of archæology, of merchandise, have been greatly improved (see for instance Ezekiel's well-known comparison of Tyre to one of her own ships laden with precious wares, *Ezek.* 27): while similar care may be noticed in the nomenclature of the New Testament (as in 'the Skull' *Luke* 23^{33}, 'the Market of Appius' *Acts* 28^{15}, 'the courts are open, and there are proconsuls' *Acts* 19^{38}).

Such illustrations might easily be multiplied at great length. On the other hand the critics of the Revised Version found it no less easy to draw up lists of what they alleged to be needless change. Many of these alterations, however, resulted automatically from the principle which the Revisers imposed on themselves as their first law, that of faithfulness to the original text. If St. Paul repeated the same word two or three times in as many verses, or even in the same verse, so would they, at whatever cost to agreeableness of rhythm, at whatever risk of monotony. No one doubts now that they were right. The demands of modern scholarship have largely increased (especially in the emendation of the Old Testament text); and no revision can ever claim finality. But the revision begun in 1871 marks an important stage in the treatment and appreciation of the Bible, and the day is probably not far distant when the general advance of knowledge will call for the adoption of the new Version in the public services of all branches of the Church.

LECTURE III.

CHANGED VIEWS OF THE LAW

THE aims and processes of critical enquiry into the composition and meaning of ancient documents have always a twofold significance. It is the object of the student to discover, in the first place, the *external* facts about any literary work transmitted from antiquity. When was it first known to exist? How far back can it be traced? What witnesses testify to its recognition, and what is the value of their evidence? The answers to these questions may be more or less complete, or more or less imperfect; but they are sure to suggest further examination of the contents of the work, and a new set of *internal* facts may then be noted. Does it contain any record of its own composition? Is it possible to trace the materials which the writer employed, to determine their relative age, and fix the mode in which they were finally combined together? Not till this has been provisionally accomplished can the critic enter on the second part of his task, the historical reconstruction of the past. And this

is of necessity often based on broader foundations than the analysis of any particular book. It requires a wide survey of many and various groups of circumstance; and that view will be found to be the most probable which best combines the largest number of most important facts. In the Old Testament the most significant alterations wrought by these principles of investigation during the last century concern the five books of the Law, or the Pentateuch,[1] and some of the books of the second great division of the ancient Hebrew collection, viz., the Prophets. In each case the processes of literary and historical research have led to a vast transformation in our ideas of their meaning and worth. Let us attempt to sketch this change, first, in our estimate of the Law.

I.

The prevailing conception of the Bible as the 'Word of God' commonly expressed itself in the belief that it was, in some sense, one book. The divine Author naturally imprinted on the product a certain unity of purpose and meaning. In other words, there was a definite relation between its parts. This was plainly higher and more penetrating than a mere sequence in time. Christianity was born in the midst of Judaism, and the Old Testament was closed before a line of the New was written. But the Old Testament was more than

[1] The 'Five-fold book,' as it was called by Origen of Alexandria and Tertullian of Carthage.

the simple antecedent of the New. There was a vital connexion between the two. The earlier system not only prepared the way for the later, it implicitly contained it.

The nature of this connexion was a frequent theme of speculation among the early Christian believers. Their thoughts played around it with a singular mixture of fancy and reasoning. Even in the Gospels themselves there are traces of more than one answer to the questions which it suggested, and the apostolic correspondence is full of hints and allusions to themes which doubtless received ampler development from the preachers of the Church. The accepted methods of the time fully justified this treatment. The theologians of the Synagogue had practically worked out the idea that any verse of their Scriptures might be explained with the help of any other verse. Heedless of the context, they wrenched away a passage which perhaps contained the same number, or a similar turn of phrase, or some superficial parallel of thought, and applied the one to illustrate the other. They lived and taught in an imaginative atmosphere in which suggestions of likeness became realities; symbols were converted into truths; and some quaint and fanciful resemblance sufficed to establish an identity. This was not peculiar to the Rabbis of Israel. From other causes, and along different lines, the poems of Homer—the earliest literary deposit of Greek religion—and even the later odes of Pindar, were handled by the teachers of the great schools of the Empire in much the

same way. And the Jews of Alexandria, steeped in the culture of Greece, sought to show that Plato and Aristotle had borrowed from Moses, and by extravagant allegories converted the Pentateuch into a sort of mother of philosophies.[1]

The modern reader of the letter of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians cannot easily bring himself into sympathy with the strange series of parallels by which the Law and the Gospel are compared with the two sons of Abraham, Ishmael child of the bondwoman Hagar, and Isaac child of the free woman Sarah, while Hagar, first identified with Mount Sinai, is then presented as the Jerusalem that now is, Sarah suggesting by contrast the Jerusalem which is above. The persons of Hebrew story, geographical realities, and spiritual symbols, all seem hopelessly confused. Still more strange appears the Apostle's adoption of the Rabbinic legend of the wandering rock that followed the Israelites in the wilderness to supply them with water, and his sudden identification of the rock with Christ.[2] It is not then surprising that in *1 Peter* $3^{20\text{-}21}$ the deliverance of Noah and his family in the ark 'through water' should have its counterpart in baptism; or that Paul should blend the figures of the pillar of cloud and the divided waters at the Exodus, and should describe the passage of the Red Sea as a 'baptism into Moses.'

It is of course in the Epistle to the Hebrews that

[1] Cp. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, 1886 (Bampton Lecture for 1885), Lect. II. 'Rabbinic Exegesis,' Lect. III. 'Alexandrian Exegesis.'

[2] *1 Cor.* 10^{4}.

this style of interpretation receives its completest exemplification. That little treatise has been aptly described as 'the first apology for Christianity.'[1] Its main object is to vindicate the displacement of the venerable Levitical worship with its central sanctuary, its priesthood, and its sacrifices, by a religion which appeared to have none of these things. In doing so, its first assumption is that the entire series of institutions grouped around the Mosaic tabernacle was essentially divine. They were, indeed, only the earthly counterparts of heavenly realities. According to a mode of thought familiar in ancient India, where the poets were believed to have 'seen' the Vedic hymns which existed eternally in the world of the uncreated and unborn,[2] Moses had been permitted to behold the ideal forms of the sanctuary and its furniture; and God had laid on him the solemn charge —'See that thou make them after their pattern, which hath been showed thee in the mount.'[3] The historic institutions of Israel were thus only a 'copy and shadow'[4] of the celestial order; they belonged to space and time, to particular localities and persons. Under these conditions of sense and change they had inevitably the characters of derivation and impermanence; only the unseen is the truly real. It is the aim of the writer, therefore, to show that Christianity provides an enduring high-priesthood, a perpetual sanctuary, and a sacrifice which, being 'for ever' (10^{12}), has an ideal or eternal value never

[1] So Dr. A. B. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p.x.

[2] See Lect. VIII. § ii. [3] *Exod.* 25^{40}. [4] *Hebr.* 8^{5}.

to be attained by the daily repetition of the altar rites. His whole delineation of the meaning of Christ's function in relation to God on the one hand, and to man on the other, hangs on the forms supplied by the ancient law. Though they are now superseded, they were once clothed with the express sanction of revelation; and all the institutions of the old are reproduced spiritually, even while they are actually transcended, by the new.[1]

Out of these conceptions, at first quite vague and inexact, emerged the more definite ideas summed up in the words 'type' and 'antitype.' 'Adam,' said the apostle Paul, was 'a type (R.V. *figure*) of him that was to come' (*Rom.* 5^{14}); and in the incidents of Israel's wanderings he saw the 'types' (R.V. *examples*) which were full of warning for his own day; they happened 'typically' (R.V. *by way of example*, or *figure*); but they were written (he adds) 'for our warning, on whom the ends of the ages have come' (1 *Cor.* $10^{6\,11}$). The type, then, is the Old Testament prefiguration; the New Testament reality to which it points, is the 'antitype,' standing over against it as its counterpart, related to the type as the true original to the provisional copy, or the actual object to its mere shadow. So baptism is the 'antitype' to the water of the flood (1 *Pet.* 3^{21}).[2]

Between these two terms existed a subtle and

[1] The same theme is treated, but in a much coarser form, in the Epistle of Barnabas, contained in the great Sinaitic MS. of the New Testament.

[2] In *Hebr.* 9^{24}, however, the use is inverted; and the 'manufactured sanctuary' is the 'antitype' (R.V. *pattern*) of the spiritual reality.

mysterious connexion. In the process of allegorical interpretation the persons and events of ancient story were treated as the symbols of facts or thoughts in some quite different field. But there was no reason why they should not serve the same purpose in very various ways, as illustrations of moral and religious truth. The application was not part of the story itself; it was devised by the interpreter. The type and the antitype, however, belonged to a definitely constituted order. They were bound together in the purpose of God; they entered into the providential design which made all history one. In exploring the scope of Revelation, accordingly, the theologians of the past gave to the entire system of these hidden relations the name of 'typology.' It was a favourite theme of the divines of the seventeenth century.[1] To discover the types in the Old Testament and their antitypes in the New was more than a pious pastime; it was regarded as a serious contribution to religious truth. Systems were devised for its regulation, and controversies arose over its legitimate limits. One of the last of these expositions, *The*

[1] Thus it held a prominent place in the *Philologia Sacra* of Salomon Glassius, 1623, which went through repeated editions. In vol. i., 1711 (Amsterdam), book II. contains a long section on 'Types' including 9 canons of interpretation (pp. 211-5). In a subsequent edition (Leipzig, 1797) *his temporibus accommodata*, all this is set aside (vol. ii. pp. 22-29). Such was the progress of German Rationalism. Other works had a longer life in this country. The *Tropologia*, or 'Key to open the Scripture Metaphors and Types,' by Benjamin Keach, a Baptist minister, first published in 1682, obtained reissue as late as 1779. Guild's *Moses Unvailed*, 1620, reached a sixth edition at Edinburgh, 1839; while Worden's *The Types Unveiled, or the Gospel Picked out of the Legal Ceremonies*, 1664, made its last appearance in 1840, under the auspices of the Religious Tract Society.

Typology of Scripture, from the pen of the late Dr. Patrick Fairbairn, Principal of the Free Church College in Glasgow, and one of the Revisers of the Old Testament, reached its fifth edition in 1870.

The type and the antitype, it has been already observed, were united by divine arrangement; their relation was involved in a pre-ordained connexion. This implied, according to the typologist, that 'the realities of the Gospel which constitute the antitypes, are the ultimate object which were contemplated by the mind of God when planning the economy of his successive dispensations,' and further that 'to prepare the way for the introduction of these ultimate objects, He placed the Church under a course of training which included instruction by types, or designed and fitting resemblances of what was to come.'[1] If it was asked how far this system of interpretation should be carried, different answers might be given. Bishop Marsh, for example, argued that only those persons and things could be regarded as types which were expressly declared by Christ or his apostles to have been designed as prefigurations.[2] But to the convinced typologist, resting on the essential unity between the Old dispensation and the New, this seemed too narrow a limitation. What was

[1] Fairbairn, *Typology*, i. p. 69.

[2] *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. 1842, p. 373. Marsh's reasons were obvious; a system which was founded by God himself could not be left to chance interpretation. As it was recorded by inspiration, so it needed inspiration to explain it. This was the necessary safeguard against wild aberrations of which examples were only too plentiful.

there in Sarah and Hagar which qualified them for this character while Rebekah was excluded? If Melchizedek, who appeared but once upon the sacred page, belonged to the divine system, could no place be found for personages so much more familiar as Joseph or Joshua? and Samson surely claimed admission beside Jonah. The passage of the Red Sea, the incidents of the wanderings, were full of their appointed meanings; were, then, the crossing of the Jordan and the entrance into the promised land without part in the great harmony?

It was, however, on the Levitical ritual that attention was pre-eminently fixed. This had at once a shell and a kernel. The rites and observances which it enjoined were but the outer covering or vehicle of an inner essence, the spiritual relations which they anticipated, the spiritual truths which they embodied and expressed. During the long history from Moses to Christ the condition of fallen humanity remained unchanged; man had the same sinfulness and the same needs; and the same God condescended to provide for them. Under the Old covenant and the New, worship must have been founded on the same principles, and in their 'pre-established harmony' lay 'the bond of union between the symbolical institutions of Judaism and the permanent realities of Messiah's kingdom.'[1] The Tabernacle, accordingly, was 'constructed so as to express God's ideas, not man's';[2] for this end was the pattern shown to Moses on the mount, 'plainly indicating

[1] Fairbairn, *Typology*, i. p. 77. [2] *Ibid.* ii. p. 236.

the high importance which was attached in the mind of God to the proper construction of this divine habitation,' and what fulness of meaning it was designed to express. Every detail, therefore, had some hidden value; the colours of the curtains, for example, were chosen with the Lord's intent, one interpreter finding red 'significant in its purple shade of the majesty, in its scarlet of the life-giving property of God'; while another saw in red 'the expression of God's love, inclining as purple to the mercies of grace, and as scarlet to the jealousy of judgment.'[1] The use

[1] A recent specimen of 'legitimate typical interpretation' is offered by the Rev. R. L. Ottley, sometime Principal of the Pusey House, Oxford, in his *Aspects of the Old Testament*, 1898, p. 261. 'In its general character it is not difficult to see that the 'Tent of Meeting' is a type of Him who was *made flesh and tabernacled among us;* and that each several part or chamber is emblematic of a dispensation in redemptive history. The outer court with its bleeding sacrifices and its laver of purification symbolizes the preparatory stage of Mosaism with its sacrificial system and comprehensive ceremonialism. The number five, which is the prevailing figure in the measurements of the court, being half of ten, the number of perfection, serves to convey the moral idea of incompleteness, while the inferior metals employed in the construction of the altar and the laver symbolize what is imperfect and rudimentary. The Holy Place entered by the veil which separated it from the court contained three symbolic objects—the golden altar of incense, the table on which stood the pure vegetable oblation of the shewbread, and the seven-branched candlestick with its lamps. Here faith may find a type or representation of the Christian Church with its Eucharist, its sevenfold gift of the Spirit, its perpetual intercession in union with that of its ascended High Priest. . . . . The realities of heaven itself were typified by the most Holy Place. Its very form was an emblem of God's dwelling-place, *for the length and the breadth and the height of it* were equal. It formed a perfect cube of ten cubits, as if to suggest the ideal ultimate perfection which the kingdom of God was destined to attain.'

Similarly (p. 263) 'the colours also are symbolic: white is the emblem of holiness, of soiled robes cleansed from stain. Blue, the colour of the sapphire stone, suggested the heavenliness of the divine calling. Scarlet, the colour of blood, signifies created life. Purple, the intermingling of scarlet and blue, is a symbol of the union of two natures, divine and human.'

of the laver, the daily ritual of the altar (or, as Dr. Fairbairn grimly translates its distinctive name, 'the slaughtering-place'), the appointed ceremonies for the Nazirite or the leper, all fall into their places as typical of different aspects of the relation of the sinner to God, whose communion can only be realised 'through an avenue of blood,' so that 'the sentence of death must ever be found lying across the threshold of life.'[1] The pre-eminent instance of this was of course discovered in the elaborate service of the Day of Atonement.[2] Of all the ancient ritual this part 'has received the most explicit application from the pen of inspiration.' Dr. Fairbairn's exposition does not go beyond that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Other interpreters have been less reserved.[3] If the high priest robed himself

[1] *Typology*, ii. p. 301. [2] In *Levit.* 16.

[3] The curious reader may look at 'the Gospel of the Great Day of Atonement' in *The Figures and Types of the Old Testament*, by Samuel Mather (2nd ed. 1705, pp. 450-9). Mather was the eldest son of Richard Mather, minister of Toxteth Park Chapel, Liverpool, and accompanied his father to New England in 1635, as a boy of nine years old. He was educated at the newly founded Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., where he graduated M.A. in 1643. Returning to this country he became fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and was ordained to the Congregational ministry in the church of St. Nicholas, Dublin, being co-pastor with Dr. Winter, Provost of Trinity College, also a Congregationalist. After 1662* he carried on his ministry in private, and died at Dublin in 1671. His work was published posthumously by the pious care of his brother Nathanael in 1683. Mather's interpretations of *Lev.* 16 are quite restrained in comparison with those of some of his successors in the same field.

* The congregation which he had gathered continued to assemble first in his house, and then in a meeting-house which they built in New Row. From there they migrated about 1728 to a chapel erected by them in Eustace Street. In that chapel in 1828 the Rev. James Martineau was ordained to the ministry.

in white linen and then in due course laid the vestment aside, he typified the assumption by Christ of the likeness of sinful flesh, and his subsequent renunciation of it when his work on earth was done. The two goats denoted his twofold nature, the slain goat a dying, and the live goat a risen Saviour. But the live goat was banished into the wilderness, so while its slaughtered fellow prefigured the crucified Jesus, the goat devoted to Azazel found its antitype in Barabbas, or in the Jewish people sent into the desert of the wide world, with God's curse upon them.[1] The whole of the institutions under the Old Covenant were thus converted into a divine drama the significance of which was, however, hidden from the performers. Age after age the solemn ordinances imposed by Omnipotence were duly fulfilled, but priest and people were alike ignorant of what they did. The mystery was preserved for more than a thousand years. Not till the death of Christ did the commands of Heaven receive their meaning, and then they were superseded. The Law, according to this singular theory, only became intelligible at the moment when it was abolished.

II.

The system of Scriptural Typology was founded on the assumption that the first five books of the Bible were composed by Moses. The details of the religious institutions which he established were directly communicated to him by the Most High,

[1] *Ibid.* ii. p. 395.

and bore secret reference to the truths afterwards embodied in the person of Christ and the rites of the Church. How far is this view sustained by the historical enquiries of the last century?

The theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was inherited by Christianity from Judaism. It was the belief of the Rabbis. Jesus had no doubt learned it in the synagogue school, and the apostles carried it with them when they justified the new faith by appealing to the Scriptures of the old. Philo in Alexandria and Josephus in Palestine, the representatives of the finest Jewish culture in the first century of our era, both elaborately explain how Moses could write the account of his own death at the close of the book of Deuteronomy.[1] Hints of difficulty on various grounds arise here and there, but a thousand years were to pass before the famous Spanish Rabbi Ibn Ezra (1088-1167) in a commentary on *Deut.* 1[1] pointed out in veiled and mysterious language the existence of a number of passages belonging to an age much later than Moses. In the sixteenth century the new learning brought a host of critics, both Catholic and Protestant, into the field, who recognised more or less frankly that additions had been made to the Mosaic documents long after his time. Philosophy, in the persons of Thomas Hobbes and Benedict Spinoza, addressed itself more thoroughly to the

[1] On the whole critical history see Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, vol. i., 1892, vol. ii., 1898, or *The Hexateuch*, edited by Carpenter and Battersby, vol. i., 1900, or *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, by J. Estlin Carpenter, 1902, chaps. iii. and iv.

problem; the penetrating criticisms of Spinoza calling forth a remarkable defence from Father Simon, of the congregation of the Oratory in Paris, who fully admitted that the Pentateuch was compiled out of various materials, but suggested no clue to their separation. This was the achievement of another Catholic writer, Jean Astruc, a French physician (of Huguenot birth), who published anonymously at Brussels in 1753 his famous *Conjectures* concerning the original documents employed by Moses in the composition of the book of Genesis.

Astruc was the first to notice the significant fact that different parts of Genesis are distinguished by different names for the Divine Being. In one set of narratives he is designated (as in the opening story of the creation) *Elohim* or 'God'; in another *Yahweh*, represented in the English Bible by 'the Lord.'[1] No reason could be given for this singular alteration. Astruc explained it by the supposition that it was due to the use of independent documents, which had been subsequently combined by an editorial hand. He accordingly recognised two main sources, an

[1] This term has come down to us from the Latin version of the Vulgate, used in the Middle Ages, where *Dominus* was the equivalent of the Greek *ho Kurios*. The Greek was the representative, in its turn, of the Hebrew word *'Adhonay*, substituted out of reverence by the reader for the sacred name YHWH, which (it is now generally agreed) should be pronounced Yahweh or Yahwé. The English 'Jehovah,' naturalised in the A.V., and in the language of devotion, is a hybrid word which had no existence till the sixteenth century; it is in reality an adaptation to modern spelling of the four holy letters, with a modification of the vowels of the word 'Adhonay. In the following lectures, dealing with the phases of the religion of Israel, the ancient national name of Israel's Deity will be employed.

Elohim narrative, and a Yahweh story, running through the book from the beginning to the end.[1] At once a flood of light was thrown upon the peculiarities of the book. Duplicate narratives of the same event were found to keep the two names apart; while in a story like that of the Flood, where the inconsistencies had already attracted attention, the appearance of one or the other coincided with certain groups of mutually incompatible detail.

A clue was thus provided through the intricate maze of the patriarchal age, of which the scholars of Germany were ready to take advantage. Foremost of these was Johann Gottfried Eichhorn of Göttingen, who first formulated the task of what he designated (in 1787) 'the Higher Criticism,' viz. to ascertain the characteristics of the sources out of which any particular book had been compiled, to compare their representations of the same persons, events, or institutions, and determine their method and their worth. Eichhorn did not, indeed, carry his analyses in detail further than the book of Genesis: but by his conception of the true aim of literary and historical enquiry, as well as by the wide range of his learning, he became the real founder of Old Testament criticism. It was long, indeed, before a definite method was elaborated; investigation first concentrated itself upon Genesis, but the other books of the Pentateuch could not

[1] Besides these he further distinguished a series of fragments which seemed unconnected with the two chief documents, or with each other. These (ten in all) he ascribed to Midianite and other nomad tribes, as they lay for the most part outside the main current of patriarchal history.

escape the student's quest. Already in 1792 the learned Scotch Roman Catholic priest, Dr. Geddes,[1] announced three propositions in the introductory chapter prefixed to his new translation of the Scriptures: '(1) the Pentateuch in its present form was not written by Moses: (2) it was written in the land of Canaan, and most probably at Jerusalem: (3) it could not be written before the reign of David, nor after that of Hezekiah.' Concerning the materials out of which it was composed, Geddes expressed himself with both freedom and insight[2]:

'But though I am inclined to believe that the Pentateuch was reduced into its present form in the reign of Solomon, I am fully persuaded that it was compiled from ancient documents, some of which were coeval with Moses, and some even anterior to Moses. Whether all these were written records, or many of them only oral traditions, it would be rash to determine. It is my opinion that the Hebrews had no written documents before the days of Moses; and that all their history prior to that period is derived from monumental indexes or traditional tales. Some remarkable tree under which a patriarch had resided; some pillar which he had erected; some heap which he had raised; some ford which he had crossed; some spot where he had encamped; some field which he had purchased; the tomb in which he had been laid—all these served as so many links to hand his story down to posterity, and corroborated the oral testimony transmitted from generation to generation in simple narratives or rustic songs. That the marvellous would sometimes creep into these we can easily conceive; but still the essence, or at least the skeleton of history, was preserved.'

The story of the progress of critical enquiry cannot be recited here. It must suffice to summarise very briefly the main results of the literary analysis, before indicating the method of historical

[1] See Lect. I. p. 55. [2] Vol. I. p. xix.

investigation by which the constituent documents were assigned to particular periods and special national or religious interests.

The real key to the composition of the Pentateuch lies in the declaration ascribed to Elohim in *Exod.* 6:—

> 2b I am Yahweh: 3 and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (*El Shaddai*), but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them.

Such revelations are recorded to Abraham in *Gen.* 17^{1}, and to Jacob in 35^{11}. But, on the other hand, the same patriarchs receive similar revelations from Yahweh, 15^{7} and 28^{13}; altars are built to him at various places (12^{8}, $13^{4\,18}$, 21^{33}, etc.): it is in his name that Abraham's servant, in search of a bride for his master's son, is welcomed at the city of Nahor by Laban, 24^{31}; and it is of such ancient use that it can be said of the family of Adam, 'then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh,' 4^{26}.

There are, therefore, two entirely different theories of the religious history of Israel's progenitors, which run right through the book of Genesis to the age of Moses. The revelations of El Shaddai in 17 and 35 supply test-passages for the patriarchal narratives, and a document can be very easily isolated from the opening account of creation to the oppression in Egypt, consisting of a series of sections marked by the initial formula 'These are the generations . . .' (*Gen.* 2^{4a}, which no doubt once stood before 1^{1}, 6^{9}, 10^{1}, $11^{10\,27}$, $25^{12\,19}$, $36^{1\,9}$, 37^{2a}). The style and matter of this narrative are so peculiar that it can

be readily recognised, and it proves to be a brief introduction to a great book of Priestly Law, embodying the description of the 'Dwelling' (so R.V. margin rightly in *Exod.* 25[9]) contained in *Exod.* 25-31 (and again in 35-40), the establishment of the Aaronic priesthood and the inferior Levitical order, together with a vast mass of legislation in the books of Leviticus and Numbers, terminating with an account of incidents and laws assigned to the last few months of Moses' life, in *Num.* 26-36. This great collection is now commonly designated the Priestly Code, and is marked by the symbol **P**. Its central conceptions are the place of the forefathers of Israel in universal history among the nations of the earth, the covenant of Elohim with Abraham to bestow the land of Canaan on his descendants, the solemn adoption of Israel at Sinai to be his people, and the gift of certain religious institutions designed on the one hand to secure the divine presence in their midst, and on the other to preserve it inviolate by maintaining the holiness of the nation among whom he condescended to dwell.

When the sections of **P** are removed from the book of Genesis, it is soon apparent that what is left is not by any means homogeneous. There are duplicate narratives, and inconsistencies of chronology; and, above all, there are still important passages presenting the Deity as Elohim to the exclusion of Yahweh, though they cannot be assigned to the short narrative of the world's history prefixed to **P**. The same problem, therefore, again

presents itself, and the solution is similar. *There are two accounts of the revelation of the name Yahweh.* Prior to the declaration in *Exod.* 6^2, an earlier announcement to the same effect had been already made in $3^{6\,15}$. It cannot be doubted that the name in which Moses is authorised to declare his divine mission [15] is as much a new name as it is in 6^2.

There are still, therefore, two documents in the remaining mass when the summary of the 'generations' has been extricated from the complex whole. One of these begins with the story of Eden, and relates the early history of mankind on the hypothesis that the name Yahweh was universally known. Like **P**, this narrative also gradually narrows its outlook, till it concentrates its attention on the figure of Abraham and his descendants. But its author is no legalist advancing swiftly towards the solemn ordinances of Sinai. He gathers into his work the rich and varied lore of tradition; he loves the stories that have been told and re-told for generations; he delights in the play of character; he reverences the ancient sanctuaries of time-honoured worship. He tells of the divine call of Abram, and of the promise of the land to his posterity. The scene changes to Egypt, and the brilliant administration of Joseph is followed by the tyranny of Rameses; Moses receives his high charge to return to Israel as the liberator; the people escape under his guidance; and after a sojourn at Sinai where Yahweh in person descends upon the mount, the march is con-

tinued till the tribes are camped upon the Jordan bank. Here are many of the ideas which are embodied in the Priestly Code, but the atmosphere is quite different. The author's interest is engaged with the succession of events by which Yahweh's long purpose is to be realised, and the personalities through which this is effected. Of the sacred institutions so dear to **P** he knows absolutely nothing; and the brief terms of Yahweh's covenant at Sinai (*Exod.* $34^{10\text{-}27}$) ignore them altogether. From its early use of the sacred name Yahweh (Jehovah) this striking record of Israel's national life is briefly designated **J**.

There remains the third constituent of Genesis, a second narrative founded on the view that the name Yahweh was only revealed for the first time to Moses. No secure traces of this can be found prior to the days of Abraham, and its first conspicuous entry into the documentary web occurs in the story of his sojourn at the court of Abimelech of Gerar in *Gen.* 20. The extracts from it are by no means so copious as those of **J**, with which it is, indeed, closely united by many affinities both of style and thought. It follows the same course, relating the episodes of Joseph's story with great zest, and marches parallel with **J** through the plagues and the exodus, till the tribes arrive—not at Sinai, but at Horeb. There a solemn covenant is made with Israel on the basis of certain 'Words' (with which is now incorporated a collection of 'Judgments') in *Exod.* 20^{22}-23. This is the first legislation. It is

followed by the institution of a sacred tent (*Exod.* $33^{7\text{-}11}$), pitched outside the camp, to which the pillar of cloud (Yahweh's symbol) descends, and, standing at the door, talks with Moses. No priesthood is needed for its service. A young layman of the tribe of Ephraim, named Joshua, is appointed to its charge. This tent is carried with the tribes upon the march; it is the scene of striking episodes in *Num.* 11-12; and is last mentioned in *Deut.* $31^{14\,15\,23}$, when the pillar of cloud again stands by the tent-door, and gives Joshua the son of Nun a charge to prepare him for the leadership which Moses is about to lay down. The general ideas of this narrative resemble those of **J**; but it is distinguished by the emphasis which it lays on the prophetic character and gift. It expressly designates Abraham as a 'prophet,' *Gen.* 20^{7}, though we are told elsewhere that this term first entered Israel's vocabulary in Samuel's time (1 *Sam.* 10^{9}); it gives the same title to Miriam; and it assigns to Moses, when Joshua is jealous of an infringement of his master's prerogative, the sublime aspiration 'Would that all Yahweh's people were prophets' (*Num.* 11^{29}). The restriction of the narrative to the use of the divine name Elohim prior to the revelation to Moses, has secured for it the letter **E**.

Of these three documents are the first four books of the Pentateuch composed. The relation of **J** and **E** is so close, they are so clearly welded together independently of **P**, that they may practically be regarded as one, and we may say—speaking broadly, —that the collection from Genesis to Numbers is

compiled out of **P** and **JE**; moreover, their literary form is determined by the fact that the editor used **P** as his groundwork, and inserted into it portions of the united product **JE**.[1] But what, in this respect, is the place of Deuteronomy?

In the chronology of the Pentateuch the book of Deuteronomy is attached to the last year of the life of Moses ($2^{7\,14}$, etc.). Its opening retrospect recites the story of the conquest of the territory east of the Jordan, the overthrow of Sihon and Og, and the preparation of the people for the march into the promised land. The passage across the Wady Zered (*Deut.* 2^{13}) is identical with that in *Num.* $21^{12,13}$. Deuteronomy, therefore, covers the same time as *Num.* 26-36.[2] But how great is the difference! Important events, like the census in *Num.* 26, or the campaign against the Midianites, 31, are never named. Laws on similar subjects, such as the right of asylum, are common to both (*Num.* $35^{9\text{-}34}$, and *Deut.* $19^{1\text{-}13}$), but they not only vary in language and style, they presuppose independent religious and social institutions. The Levites, for instance, are formally endowed with forty-eight cities, *Num.* $35^{1\text{-}8}$, and their surrounding lands; while Deuteronomy repeats again and again that the Levites 'have no inheritance,' they live in the villages and hamlets, and in their poor estate are repeatedly commended, along with the poor and the orphan, to the bounty of

[1] This, it will be noted, is wholly independent of the question of the relative ages of these works.

[2] Already assigned to P, see p. 115.

the prosperous householder. It is inconceivable that these two sets of laws can proceed from the same hand within a few months. The book of Deuteronomy, then, stands apart by its situation from the joint narrative **JE** (to which, however, it frequently refers); and by its contents from **P**. In the documentary notation it is naturally represented by **D**. The Pentateuch, accordingly, which opens with the stately narrative of creation prefixed to the Priestly Code, and closes with the impassioned exhortations of Moses in the plains of Moab, may be resolved into its constituent elements as **P**, **JE**, and **D**.[1]

III.

The literary separation of the materials, however, tells us nothing of their various ages or their mutual relations. But it soon becomes certain that the three great works **P**, **JE**, and **D**, were not all produced together. There must, therefore, be some time-order among them; at least an attempt must be made to arrange them in some sequence. Yet even this result, if it can be reached, is not final; it may give us a literary chronology, it tells us nothing of the places of the separate books in the actual centuries. Two questions, accordingly, soon emerge in our enquiry; (1) in what succession were these documents actually composed? and (2) is it possible to fix the date of any of them in the actual chron-

[1] These documents may be studied separately in the treatise of Mr. Addis cited above, p. 110.

ology of Israel? These are the problems of historical criticism. Owing to special circumstances—the independent position of **D**, and its relation to a great national and religious event, the reformation carried out by Josiah in the year 621 B.C.,—the second of these two questions was the first to receive satisfactory answer.

This answer came from a young student of twenty-five, W. M. L. De Wette, who published at Halle in 1806 the first part of a remarkable little treatise modestly entitled *Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament*.[1] This book laid the foundation of the historical criticism of the Pentateuch. The writer pointed out that the central institution of the Priestly Code, the Dwelling and its ritual, assumed that sacrificial worship (and there was then no other) could be offered only at one place. That also was the demand of the fundamental law of *Deut.* 12, expressly limiting the popular sacrifices to 'the place which Yahweh should choose,' which De Wette had no difficulty in identifying with Jerusalem. On the other hand, the whole history of Israel for hundreds of years after the settlement under Joshua, showed that this principle had in no way controlled the religious practice of the nation. Neither **P** nor **D** is ever recognised, and the actual proceedings of the accredited leaders of the nation, priests, prophets, and kings, are in complete contradiction of their demands. This method of comparing particular documents with the actual circumstances recorded

[1] The second volume followed in 1807.

in history was really applied for the first time in any detail to the books of the Pentateuch by De Wette. On general grounds, then, both **P** and **D** must be later than the time of Samuel. The fact that the description of the Levitical Dwelling in *Ex.* 25-28 could not be reconciled with that of the Tent of Meeting in 33^{7-11}, and that its arrangements were plainly modelled on those of the Temple in the capital, brought **P** into the age of Solomon or later. But for **D** a more precise date could be fixed. It expressly sanctioned the monarchy, while forbidding a repetition of Solomon's excesses, *Deut.* 17^{14-17}. Moreover, in 4^{9} 17^{3} it denounced a particular foreign worship prohibited in no other laws, the cultus of 'the host of heaven.' These rites, the historian of the monarchy informs us (2 *Kings* 21^{3-5}), were first introduced by Manasseh (692-639, B.C.). The inference was natural, Deuteronomy could not have been written before the seventh century B.C.[1] Already in 1651 Hobbes (like Jerome in the fourth century of our era) had identified the Deuteronomic code with the law-book discovered in the temple in the eighteenth year of the reign of Manasseh's grandson, Josiah, 621 B.C. De Wette, then, assigned

[1] This of course assumes that **D** is practically one whole, and that the passage in question was not added to the book at a later time. Recent investigation has shown reasons for thinking that several hands may be traced in the book. But all its religious laws and exhortations are cast in one mould, and stamped with one thought. There cannot be any great limit of time-variation among them; moreover, numerous other indications (which there is no space to mention here, see *Composition of the Hexateuch*, chap x.), converge on the same century.

D without hesitation to the seventh century; and this result has since stood practically secure.[1]

The condition of documentary analysis when De Wette wrote, did not enable him to form any clear conception of the rest of the materials composing the first four books of the Pentateuch. He recognised that the bulk of the Levitical legislation belonged to a group of narratives beginning in Genesis, which as a whole he designated the Epos of the Hebrew theocracy. This corresponds to the modern **P**.[2] By the middle of the century, however, a much clearer discrimination had been reached, and the great interpreter of Hebrew thought and life, Heinrich Ewald (1803-75) expounded it (in his own form) as the preliminary to his great reconstruction of the history of Israel,[3] in which he gathered up the labours of thirty years. To **P** he gave the name of the 'Book of Origins' (the 'generations' of our Bible); and he supposed it to have been compiled under priestly influences in the age of Solomon,

[1] It is still a moot point whether the code was compiled under Manasseh, or in the reign of Josiah himself. Much attention has of late been directed to the sources that lay behind it, the various elements, historic, legal, and hortatory, which may be traced within it, and the editorial processes by which these were combined in their present form. For a detailed discussion of these questions, see *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, chap. x.

[2] At a later date his views became more defined. In 1843 Theodore Parker, of Roxbury, Massachusetts, published a translation of the fifth edition of De Wette's *Introd. to the O.T.* (originally issued in 1817). Here the contents of the first four books are distributed between an Elohist and a Jehovist; but there is no distinction made between different Elohistic writers in *Genesis*, though the existence of triple forms of the same story is sometimes recognised.

[3] First edition, 1843-59. See the *History of Israel*, edited by R. Martineau, Carpenter, etc.

when it was called into existence by the needs of the Temple worship. This was the literary foundation of the entire collection, and it extended into the book of Joshua. Then came a series of prophetic writers (practically three), whose work might be traced in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers. This group embraced the modern **JE**, and was distributed through the ninth and eighth centuries from the days of Elijah to the earlier part of the brilliant reign of Jeroboam II. (782-743, B.C.). Lastly, the book of Deuteronomy, written in the reign of Manasseh, and published under Josiah, was attached to the preceding collection before the end of the seventh century, the whole being revised by a final editor. Such is a broad outline of the view which Ewald impressed on an entire generation of students. With vast learning, quickened by a passionate sympathy with the genius of Israel, he attempted to do for the Hebrew people what Niebuhr had done for Rome. He grasped the important idea that the patriarchal stories really represent the relations of tribes, and frequently conceal under the forms of family history the vicissitudes of inter-tribal events. But his method as a historian often appeared defective. Sometimes it seemed as if he could neither form a definite conception of actual fact, nor realise that it was unattainable. In his literary analysis he was often arbitrary, in his critical judgments intolerant; nor was he free from the whimsical and fantastic, as in his insistence that the story of Samson had originally formed a five-act drama, two feats belong-

ing to the cycle being now omitted. But he had an overwhelming sense of the greatness of Israel's religious work, and the inner meaning of its history. No other writer so profoundly sympathised with the spirit of Hebrew prophecy, or marshalled in more splendid array the long procession of heroes from Moses to Christ. The principle of the unity of Israel's development found in him a strenuous champion; he insisted on the continuity of Christianity with the past; included the life of Jesus in the history of his race; and presented the whole vast sequence as one mighty epic of the true faith.

In this country the labours of Geddes found no successor. The fate of Milman's attempt to bring the representations of the patriarchal and Mosaic ages into the field of history has been already mentioned.[1] The stupor which enthralled English Biblical study checked all enquiry. But at length a strenuous voice was lifted up in protest. In 1847 Francis William Newman[2] issued a *History of the Hebrew Monarchy*. The following passage clearly states the difficulty:—

'If the Hebrew history has hitherto been nearly as a sealed book to us, it is because all the academical and clerical teachers of it are compelled to sign thirty-nine articles of religion before assuming their office. It is not easy to conceive how little we might know of Greek history, if from the revival of Greek studies test articles had been imposed with a view to perpetuate the ideas of it current in the fifteenth century; but it is easy to assure

[1] See Lect. I, p. 19.

[2] Brother of the more famous cardinal. Born in 1805, he was at that time professor of Latin in University College, London.

the spiritual significance of Israel's history, and the same unwillingness to place his subject in the sharp focus of historical fact. Again and again the reader asks his guide 'What actually happened?' and is answered with a text. The method of enveloping persons and events in a golden haze in which all definite outline disappears in poetic radiance, may be not inapt for piety or edification, but it is useless to the searcher after truth.

Meanwhile more powerful forces were at work. Dr. Samuel Davidson, freed from College duties,[1] issued the first part of an elaborate *Introduction to the Old Testament* in 1862, full of German learning, which presented the Pentateuch substantially in the form **P**, **JE**, **D**.[2] Public attention, however, was chiefly occupied with the rapid development of the views of Bishop Colenso, in the successive parts of his treatise on *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua*. They exhibited, however, the defects of the method of that day, in their lack of any adequate grasp of the principle of historical development. Distributing the Pentateuch into three groups of documents, (1) the great Elohistic narrative (as it was then often designated) beginning with the first chapter of Genesis, and embracing the Levitical legislation, (2) a succession of narratives inserted into it employing the name Yahweh, and (3) the

[1] See Lect. I., p. 32.

[2] The nomenclature of those days was different. As **P** employed the name Elohim in *Genesis*, he was designated 'the Elohist.' **E**, being placed chronologically later, was styled 'the junior Elohist.' *Deuteronomy* was ascribed to 650 B.C., with Ewald, Riehm, and Bleek.

Book of Deuteronomy, he assigned the first to the age of Samuel. But he made no attempt to compare the institutions of the Levitical law with the religious conditions of Samuel's time, or to ascertain what evidence there was of their existence in the brighter days of the monarchy that followed. He was on surer ground in fixing Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah, though an attempt to identify its author with Jeremiah cannot be said to have succeeded. In Part V, published in 1865, he offered an analysis of the whole book of Genesis, verse by verse, the result of minute and laborious study, with ample linguistic justification. The elimination of the sections on 'the generations' (the modern **P**) was comparatively easy and consequently successful. This was, for the first time, printed consecutively, so that every reader could form for himself a conception of its method and style. But the critical instruments of thirty years ago were less fit to cope with the more difficult task of distributing the remainder. The work suffered especially from its limitation to Genesis. Dr. Colenso relied, also, too exclusively on his phraseological tests, and the whole treatment seemed to lack the historical atmosphere. Yet before he was to proceed to his next investigations, he was destined to undergo a complete and radical alteration of critical view. Part V. substantially adopted the German order of the documents (though with slight differences of date); the Priestly Code (**P**) was attributed to the age of Samuel; the patriarchal stories (the modern **JE**) were incor-

porated under the empire of David and Solomon; Deuteronomy was written in the reign of Josiah, probably by Jeremiah. In his next Part (1872) the great collection of Priestly Legislation from *Exod.* 6 onwards was carried down beyond the Captivity, and declared to be the result of codification by Jewish scribes in Babylonia. There, in the judgment of the great majority of modern critics, in Germany, Holland, and France, in Great Britain and America, representing a wide variety of theological belief, it remains firmly planted and defies attack.

How was this remarkable change effected, and what has been its significance for our modern thought?

IV.

The theory of the Pentateuchal documents which may be said now to hold the field, arranges them in the following order, **JE**, **D**, **P**, and finds a point of attachment with secular chronology in the publication of the Deuteronomic Code in the year 621 B.C. The dependence of the Deuteronomic homilists on the collections of ancient tradition now embodied in **JE** needs no demonstration; equally clear is it that a large portion of the 'Judgments' of the first Legislation in *Exod.* 21-23 reappears—sometimes with important modifications—in **D**. What conception, then, does modern criticism form of the origin of these earlier documents?

That they repose upon earlier traditions, that these traditions sprang out of the relations of tribes

and groups of tribes to one another, that they tended to acquire more systematic form in the process of generations, that in many cases they were connected (as Geddes so shrewdly conjectured) with notable monuments of time-honoured antiquity, or in others (as in the Bethel stories) were affixed to the local sanctuaries to justify the inclusion of the sacred trees or stone-pillars of Canaanite origin in the cultus of Yahweh—all this may be said to be now generally recognised. The traditions are, however, brought into a definite genealogical scheme, and Jacob-Israel with his twelve sons represents the nation as it was first possible to conceive it after the genius of David had welded it together and made it secure against its foes. With this numerous allusions seem to harmonise. The servitude of Canaan, the struggles of Edom for independence, the vigour of the Northern Kingdom of Ephraim, all point to the centuries which followed the reign of Solomon. The main idea of the election of Israel for a divine purpose, of which the gift of the land is the outward symbol, places the authors at once in connexion with one of the leading themes of early prophecy. Their religious vocabulary has numerous points of contact with such writers as Amos and Hosea. As **E** constructs his narrative on the theory that the sacred divine name was not revealed till the days of Moses, and so takes a more reflective view of the development of the national faith, it may be presumed that his work was later than that of **J** which draws no such distinctions, but imagines that

the holy name was universally known even in the earliest dawn of history. But it has become abundantly clear that neither **J** nor **E** can properly be ascribed to single authors. They contain materials of such various ages, they have so obviously acquired their present form by gradual accretion, they have undergone so many modifications, enlargements, harmonisings, that they must be regarded as the products of historico-religious schools rather than of individual writers.[1] The roots of **J** are probably planted deep in Judah, while those of **E** are spread through Ephraim and the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. The first collection of **J**'s traditions in continuous form may perhaps have been effected in the ninth century B.C., as the result of the movement which called for a literary record of the origins of the monarchy. It is now recognised that such collections did not stop with the delineation of the Mosaic age, or even with the settlement under Joshua. They extended through the period of the Judges; much of the material in the books of Samuel may be referred to them; they may even be traced in the opening chapters of the books of Kings. The union of **J** and **E** in a kind of primitive harmony was probably effected before the composition of Deuteronomy, and may be provisionally set down at about 650 B.C. But this did not exclude the possibility of subsequent additions; and it is certain that when **D** was incorporated with the united product many

[1] For illustrations of similar processes in our own early literature, and in other fields, see *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, pp. 6-12.

changes took place, and the whole work was subjected to a continuous revision.[1]

A different line of argument leads to the determination of the place of P. It has already been hinted that the two great legislative sections *Num.* 26-36 and *Deut.* 12-26, which Pentateuchal chronology (on the assumption of Mosaic authorship) places within a few months (or even weeks) of each other, imply the existence of quite different social and religious institutions. They must belong, therefore, to different stages of Israel's history. This becomes clear from a similar instance when the fundamental law of the unity of the sanctuary in *Deut.* 12 is compared with the permission accorded in the First Legislation, *Exod.* 20^{24}. There numerous altars are sanctioned, and Yahweh promises to come with blessing wherever the worshipper commemorates his name. That rule reflects the usage of the whole period preceding the great Deuteronomic reform, which was evoked when the abuses at the local sanctuaries could no longer be endured by the prophetic spirit. The study of the codes embodying the regulations for Israel's worship, in connexion with the evidence of popular practice, thus acquires a fundamental significance.

This was first perceived, as has been already indicated, by De Wette in the case of Deuteronomy itself. But he attempted no detailed comparison between that book and the Levitical legislation. As early as 1832, however, Prof. Reuss at Strasburg

[1] See *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, chap. xvi.

announced in his lecture-room that much of the priestly law in the middle books was later than Deuteronomy; but he did not venture to publish an opinion so contrary to received views. Two young scholars, Vatke and George, arrived by independent lines in 1835 at the same result.[1] The opposition which their work excited prevented further progress in that direction, till a little known Dutch scholar, Abraham Kuenen, was bold enough (in 1861) to declare his belief that the priestly law contained passages which could only be understood as developments of **D**, and the way was prepared for a decisive attack on the traditional criticism. At the close of 1865, Karl Heinrich Graf, who had been a pupil of Reuss, published two essays on the historical books of the Old Testament. The study of the records of Israel before and during the monarchy convinced him that the Levitical code was not in existence between the settlement in Canaan and the conquest of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. On the other hand, the Chronicler, writing early in the Greek age (about 300 B.C.) is perfectly familiar with it. During this interval, then, it must have been adopted as the rule of the national worship. Graf, moreover, discerned that the contents of **P** themselves belonged to various dates. Fixing on the group of laws and exhortations in *Lev.* 17-26 (since designated the Holiness-legislation), he pointed to its numerous parallels with the writings of the prophet Ezekiel,

[1] Vatke's *Biblische Theologie* was in reality a profound study in the philosophy of history, but its Hegelian terminology was not attractive.

and even thought it possible to identify him as the author. Other passages had been incorporated by Ezra after the captivity. In this country Dr. Kalisch, once a stout champion of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, published a commentary on *Leviticus* in 1867, in which the arguments of George and Vatke were revived and enforced. Kuenen adopted the new position as the basis of his great work on the *Religion of Israel* (1869-70). The brilliant series of articles by Wellhausen (1876) compelled the attention of Germany, and from that time the 'Grafians,' as the little band of his followers were contemptuously designated, began to find agreement take the place of ridicule. Step by step, with fresh support here, with modifications there, the new conception established itself. In this country it was convincingly expounded by Prof. W. Robertson Smith,[1] who made it the basis of the treatment of the Old Testament in the ninth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica. Its embodiment by Prof. Driver at Oxford in his well-known *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, and by Prof. (now Bishop) Ryle of Cambridge in his admirable essay on *The Canon of the Old Testament*, sent it into all the theological colleges of the land. Even into the venerable pages of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* did it force its way;[2] and the latest presentations of Biblical learning, whether under the guidance of Dr. Hastings,[3] or of Prof. Cheyne and Dr. Sutherland

[1] In *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1881; 2nd ed. 1892.

[2] See the new edition of vol. i., published in 1893.

[3] *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols., 1898-1902.

Black,[1] unhesitatingly adopt it. Some further clues to this widely received conclusion may here be added.

The language of **D** throughout implies that the principle of the unity of the sanctuary has yet to be recognised. It is an urgent demand in the interests of religious reform; and one of the objects of the Deuteronomists is to provide for the consequent modifications of ancient usage. But in **P** this principle is everywhere taken for granted. It receives splendid expression in the creation of the 'Dwelling' which **D** never mentions, and the whole presentation of the Levitical ritual rests upon it as a matter of course.[2] The Deuteronomic protest has thus won the day. New questions arise, however, concerning the right to minister at the altar. The Deuteronomists repeatedly describe the whole tribe of Levi as endowed with priestly functions; and even endeavour to secure for the disestablished clergy of the village shrines the opportunity of serving at the temple. This aim was indeed frustrated by the Jerusalem guild, jealous of their metropolitan privileges. But out of the situation thus created sprang in due course a practical distinction between two orders of Levitical functionaries. This distinction is presented in the Priestly Code with the utmost sharpness and severity. No Levite may aspire to the duties of the altar or the holy place reserved for

[1] *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vols. i.-iii., 1899-1902. The fourth volume has not yet appeared.

[2] On an exception in *Lev.* 17 see the note in *The Hexateuch*, vol. ii.

the priest *under pain of death*. Here is a cleavage through the sacred tribe which is not only unrecognised in **D**, but absolutely inconsistent with its emphatic declarations. The mere statement of this fact would seem sufficient justification for treating the Levitical arrangements as later in time, and on this point the testimony of the prophet Ezekiel is practically conclusive. Far away in his Babylonian exile he beholds a restored Israel, cleansed by the gift of a new spirit, once more occupying its ancient land. Upon the sacred hill he depicts another temple, and then proceeds to set forth the ordinances of its worship (*Ezek.* 40-48). Some of these vary so much from Pentateuchal demands that in later times it was actually proposed to remove the offending book from the Canon. But the most significant divergence goes much deeper than the number of victims at a particular feast, or the repetition of ceremonies of atonement at the opening of the first and seventh months. He proclaims for the first time, $44^{7\text{-}16}$, a division of the Levitical tribe into two orders, one of which shall have the right of the priesthood, and the other not. This partition is expressly grounded on their past conduct. Some of them had permitted the employment of Gentiles in the holy house, and the guilty Levites are consequently to be excluded from the privileges which they had abused. They may, indeed, guard the gates, and slay the offerings, and cook the sacrificial food. But no more shall they approach Yahweh. It is not necessary to enquire whether

Ezekiel rightly judged their case. The point is that certain Levites will in the future be deprived of rights which they have hitherto enjoyed unchallenged; while the Priestly Code forbids them the exercise of those functions under pain of death. Ezekiel proposes to create an inferior order of clergy by way of penalty and degradation. In **P** the admission of the Levites to attendance on the superior priests is represented as a privilege due to the gracious election of Yahweh himself, who accepts them as the equivalent of his sacred due, the first-born sons of the whole people. The inference is inevitable. Ezekiel had been a Jerusalem priest, and he was wholly unacquainted with the Levitical arrangements of **P.** In other words, those arrangements did not yet exist.

At what time, then, do they first enter within historic view? In answering this question Kuenen pointed to the story of the publication of a book of law under the direction of Ezra during the administration of Nehemiah in 444 B.C.[1] A great meeting took place at Jerusalem on the old New Year's Day, near the end of our September, before the water-gate (*Neh.* 8[1]). From a large wooden pulpit on which stood Ezra and his supporters, the law was solemnly read aloud to the assembled men and women through the morning hours till noon, and this public lection was continued the next day. What was the law-book? One precious clue to its contents survives in

[1] This is the received date; it is, however, exposed to some doubt, and may have been a little later.

the statement that preparation was then made for an Eight Days' celebration of the Feast of Booths. The observance of a great autumn harvest festival is commanded in all the early codes, in the covenant-words of **J** on Sinai,[1] in the 'words of Yahweh' reported by **E** from Horeb,[2] in the calendar of the annual feasts in *Deut.* 16. **D** is the first to designate it 'Booths,' and to prescribe a seven days' celebration. But the Levitical calendar lengthens it to eight,[3] and enjoins further the actual construction of festal booths out of boughs of trees, which were now seen in Jerusalem for the first time. The statement that no such ritual had been observed since the days of Joshua, is equivalent to saying that it was wholly new. Was Ezra's law-book, then, our Pentateuch complete, or was it the Priestly Code alone, not yet united with the earlier documents? On this matter opinion is still divided, and weighty names may be quoted on either side.[4] In any case it is practically certain that additions continued to be incorporated in the complex whole even as late as the third century before our era. Among such additions must probably be reckoned the ritual of the Day of Atonement,[5] *Lev.* 16, which afterwards acquired so high a place in the devotion of Israel, and expressed with so much solemnity the national consciousness of sin.

[1] *Exod.* 34^{27}. [2] *Exod.* 23^{16}. [3] *Lev.* 23^{39}.
[4] See the lists in *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. 262.
[5] See *The Composition*, etc., pp. 290[b], 300.

V.

The Pentateuch, then, as it is now understood, represents a complex growth of many centuries. Few scholars would now seek in it any *literary* material from the age of Moses; yet it contains ideas, allusions, legends, that travel back to a past already venerable when Israel crossed the Jordan and began to occupy the land of Canaan. The majestic story of creation with which **P** opens, in *Gen.* 1-2^{4a}, embodies elements of almost incalculable antiquity, still surviving in the midst of later thought. In the tale of Eden and the expulsion of the first man and his wife, primitive reflection has offered an explanation of the problem of the hardnesses of life, the man's burden of labour, the sufferings of womanhood. It is, however, impossible to review here the manifold variety of ancient lore gathered in the brief compass of the early history of mankind, prefixed in different versions to **J** and **P**.[1] Let us finally enquire what are the general consequences of the resolution of the old Mosaic unity of legislation into three successive deposits, the several codes of **JE**, **D**, and **P**.

A word must first be said about their form. Prof. Robertson Smith some time since called attention[2] to the conventions in use among ancient nations, by which the continuity of the legal system was maintained. The new law was regarded as a develop-

[1] See some remarks in Lecture VIII. § i.

[2] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed. p. 384.

ment of the old, and the same sanction was preserved without disturbance. 'In Roman jurisprudence all law was supposed to be derived from the Laws of the Twelve Tables,[1] just as in Israel all law was held to be derived from the teaching of Moses.' Moreover in the Priestly Code much important legislation is conveyed in the form of a narrative, leading to a difficulty, a question, and a decision. In other words it is full of cases elaborately designed as precedents; they are the legal fictions by which fresh rules were made binding, and permanent enactments were evolved out of hypothetical incidents in the Wilderness.

But behind Moses stands the figure of Yahweh. That sublime presence, those solemn scenes upon the sacred mount,—Sinai or Horeb—that mysterious pillar descending out of the sky and standing at the opening of the Tent to warn, to comfort, or to cheer —that radiant glory filling the holy Dwelling with its splendour,—these do not correspond to historic fact; they are the noble symbols of religious imagination. One after another of the ancient peoples of the past thus carried back the origins of its civilisation, its knowledge of the means of life, its primitive wisdom, its hallowed rites, its law and its morality, to one of the great gods, or at least to some teacher who was more than man. Beside the Nile Osiris was believed to have ordained the worship of the heavenly powers, appointed the offerings, regulated the order of ceremonies, composed the

[1] Smith cites Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 33.

texts and even the melodies for the sacred liturgies. The books of Thoth were inscribed on the walls of the temple at Edfu; in them were enshrined the secrets of divination and astronomy, of medicine, writing, drawing, of arithmetic, geometry, and mensuration, for all arts and sciences drew their origin from him. Out of the mystic deep came Ea, proclaimer of laws to the dwellers by the shore of the Persian Gulf. In 'the book of Ea,' an ancient collection of Babylonian precepts, were the King's duties defined. At a later stage, Nebo, the prophet-god, dwells in his temple at Babylon. He is the author of inspiration, science, and literature: *ilu tasmîtu*, 'god of Revelation.' The great codes of ancient India bear such names as Vishnu and Manu, the latter being the ideal progenitor of the human race, who belonged both to gods and men. On the Bactrian heights Ahura Mazda, the 'Lord all-knowing,' reveals his will in sacred colloquies with Zoroaster.[1] Zeus condescends to give laws to Minos in Crete; Apollo prompts Lycurgus; Athena, goddess of wisdom, imparts ordinances to Zaleucus for the Locrians. To Numa, the founder of Roman ceremonial law, are ascribed actual books containing the sacred lore he received from Egeria; they were buried with him, and discovered by a ploughman who accidentally ran his furrow over the hidden tomb in the year 181 B.C.

Such was the universal habit of antiquity. It was the mode in which the reverence of primitive

[1] Now embodied in the Persian Scriptures of the *Zend Avesta*.

peoples for that which they felt to be above themselves, the sanctions of law, the mysteries of religion, found concrete expression. The mind of ancient Israel was prompted by the same sentiments. What had been originally the imaginative utterance of solemn awe, became, however, in the Levitical legislation, a stereotyped formula. We can trace the literary processes by which successive laws were modified and combined by the hands of generation after generation of unknown scribes; and we can often account for the quasi-historic forms in which they represented ideas that were in themselves of high moral and religious value. But we can no longer attribute these methods to a special inspiration. It is freely admitted now that the Levitical 'Dwelling' is an ideal projection into the Mosaic age, at a distance of eight or nine centuries, of modes of worship partly traditional and partly new, which the designers sought to introduce into the temple ritual. In what sense, then, can we affirm that it was 'the spot where God could be approached, and where He deigned, under conditions of his own appointment, to draw near to man'?[1] Was it one of the chosen conditions that some of the curtains should be purple to prefigure a far-off union of two natures in one person? The old system of typology breaks down.[2] The religious institutions of Israel, like those of every other nation of antiquity, are to be

[1] Ottley, *Aspects of the Old Testament* p. 247.

[2] Compare the very different treatment by Prof. G. Adam Smith in *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, 1901, Lect. V.

explained by history, but by the history of the past, not of the future. They do not embody a divine design to provide the ideal forms for distant centuries; they are no fresh 'appointments'; they are rooted in the usages of immemorial antiquity. The symbolism of the Dwelling is founded on that of Solomon's temple; and the symbolism of the temple rested on the artistic and religious types of Assyria and Phenicia.[1] The Levitical ritual grew by slow stages out of the rude practices of Arabian tribes, modified by contact with the more developed usages of Canaan, the vocabulary of sacrifice carried by Phenician priests along the Mediterranean largely coinciding with that of Israel. In the rites of the Day of Atonement, where one goat is given to Yahweh and the other is despatched to Azazel, some ancient custom which it was found impossible to root out, seems to have been regulated and legalised.[2] But the methods of Christian 'gnosis' employed by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, while perfectly natural to his age, can no longer control our modes of thought. Least of all can they be ascribed to the Holy Ghost.[3]

[1] The lineal dimensions of the Dwelling were just half those of the temple, the plan being identical. The term *hekal* or holy place (in the temple) is traced by many scholars to the Akkadian *e-gal*, 'great house.'

[2] Cp. *Encyc. Bibl.*, i. col. 396.

[3] This seems to have been the true import of the arrangement [for the high priest to enter the holy of holies once only in the year], *the Holy Ghost signifying this* thereby,' Ottley, *Aspects of the O.T.*, p. 249, quoting *Heb.* 9^8 (the italics are Mr. Ottley's).

VI.

The meaning of the Law, then, must be sought elsewhere. It lies, of course, in the fresh light which is thrown by the story of its growth on the whole course of Israel's development. The books of national history delineate that course as a succession of apostasies, and the Deuteronomic editor of Judges throws the vicissitudes of victory and defeat into the monotonous form of repeated unfaithfulness, judgment, suffering, and repentance. It is, however, impossible, as Vatke pleaded long ago, for a whole nation suddenly to sink from a higher stage of life to a lower; and the prophetic version of the history, which assumed that the loftiest truths of later Yahwism had been enunciated by Moses and embodied in contemporary institutions, wholly failed to explain the religious chaos which followed the settlement in Canaan. Criticism has now made the history intelligible. The successive collections of the law supply a clue to the real growth of Israel's religion, and all the other great groups of its literature, in Prophecy, Psalm, and those profound discussions of life gathered under the name of Wisdom, fall into their places in connexion with it.

In this great series, the real formative power, as will be seen in the next Lecture, lies with the prophets. Within the Law, progress is marked by three stages. The first pair of documents, known in their combined form as **JE**, present the demands of prophecy, indeed, at their lowest. The variety of their elements

is, in fact, the best testimony to their antiquity. Between the limited knowledge of the Yahweh who must descend from his home in the sky to see the tower, or to find out whether the wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah is as great as report alleges, and the majesty of the Being to whom Abraham addresses the question, 'Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?' there is a vast religious interval. But already the leaven of prophecy is at work within the moulds in which the ancient story is related. Abraham goes forth trusting in the divine guidance; he waits in faith for the fulfilment of the heavenly promise of a son through whom the gift of the land shall be realised for his posterity. The conception of a transcendent purpose pervades the whole narrative, the choice of Israel to be the people of Yahweh. That choice is attested by the possession of Canaan. To this is attached one supreme demand, loyalty and obedience. That loyalty is shown in the renunciation of the worship of all other gods. But the legislative requirements are extremely simple. An altar may be erected anywhere. There is no one consecrated spot at which alone Yahweh may be approached. On the hill top, or by the fertilising well, the local sanctuaries are justified by sacred tradition. The ritual is very simple. No priesthood claims the sole privilege of sacrifice. Israel is Yahweh's 'son,' his 'firstborn,' but his religious duties are not elaborate. The earliest groups of the divine 'Words' only specify such elementary forms as attendance at the three annual feasts, the payment of sacred dues, while E adds, in *Exod.* 22^{31}:—

Ye shall be holy men unto me; therefore ye shall not eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field; ye shall cast it to the dogs.

Such was the primitive rule in which the conception of Israel's separation from the adjoining peoples, to be Yahweh's peculiar property, expressed itself. It belongs to a stage of religious practice, which under the name of 'taboo' (of Pacific origin) is now recognised to be widely spread all round the world. Among 'men of holiness,' dedicated to their God, nothing polluting must enter. Here is the first faint note of what is afterwards to become the full chorus of Levitical demands. The arrangements of the First Legislation represent an early stage of popular Yahwism, under the influence of ideas which, by way of contrast, we have called prophetic. Monotheism is not defined, but it is trembling into full consciousness; monolatry is enjoined, and idol-worship forbidden. The First Codes thus give practical shape to the higher teaching enforced by the prophets—Elijah and Elisha led the contest for Yahweh against the Tyrian Baal, but they made no war on the local Baals, any more than on the calves of Yahweh, or the tree-poles at the high places,—and may be taken to represent the general aim of religion at the beginning of the eighth century B.C.[1]

Then came the great movement of the higher

[1] I have here, and in what follows, embodied a few sentences from an essay entitled 'Through the Prophets to the Law' in the *Modern Review*, 1884. For details the reader may be referred to the Hibbert Lectures of Mr. C. G. Montefiore, 1892.

prophecy, whose splendid utterances remain to us in the books of Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah. Chastisement for the national sins, doom upon guilty idolatries and every kind of falsehood and oppression, this was the real meaning of 'Yahweh's day.' Yet the future was not without hope. Assyria might be the rod of Yahweh's anger, but its strokes would have an end, and a restored Zion should be called 'Citadel of Righteousness, Faithful City.' The Assyrians came, and Jerusalem was saved; but the reign of righteousness did not set in. Under Manasseh the very existence of Yahwism was endangered. Foreign usages of every description were poured into the country; they became fashionable at the court; they were established in the temple itself. Those who sought to vindicate the purity of their religion, paid for their boldness by their lives. For a whole generation idolatrous licence ran riot, and the struggle of the faithful was at the cost of blood and death. It was the first of that long series of martyr ages in which Israel's religion was to be tested till it was welded into an iron strength. Under such circumstances, prophecy could not remain abstract and ideal. The ends which it sought were not effected by the intervention of heaven. It must itself, therefore, enter the field of reform, and attempt to separate from the religion of Yahweh every element, native or foreign, which impaired its purity. It proposed, accordingly, to purge the national worship. 'Cast out every Canaanite or Assyrian abomination, destroy idol

and tree-pole and pillar, abolish every altar where the sacred rites cannot be guaranteed against corruption, let all Israel bring their offerings to the one place which Yahweh himself has chosen' :—this was the programme of the Deuteronomic Code. It was the practical instead of the poetic side of prophecy. But the impassioned exhortations in which the Code was enveloped, added new forces to the Law. Religion was more than ritual; Israel's holiness, his relation to Yahweh, was not fully realised by abstinence from forbidden foods, or avoidance of heathen customs like mourning mutilations for the dead. The whole moral and spiritual energies of the people must be dedicated to their God, *Deut.* $10^{12\text{-}13}$:—

> And now, Israel, what doth Yahweh thy God require of thee, but to fear Yahweh thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve Yahweh thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, to keep the commandments of Yahweh and his statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good?

This transfer of the seat of religion to the conscience and the affections really prepared the way for the ultimate severance of religion from the national cultus. It was the immediate antecedent of Jeremiah's vision of 'a new covenant' when the sacred teaching[1] should be written on men's hearts (*Jer.* $31^{33\text{-}34}$). But the time for realising this was not yet at hand. Reaction followed the high-wrought efforts of Josiah's reform. Local abuses

[1] The word *Torah*, commonly translated 'law'; for the prophetic use of the term cp. Driver, *Joel and Amos* (Cambridge Bible), p. 230.

were revived; the temple which had been so laboriously cleansed, was again defiled. Events marched swiftly to the great catastrophe, and in 586 B.C. Jerusalem fell before Nebuchadrezzar's troops. But what prophecy had not been able to accomplish on the spot, it still hoped to achieve in the future. Ezekiel announced a regeneration when the gift of the Spirit would cleanse Israel of its sin. But how should its new-born faithfulness be preserved? Once again does Prophecy prepare in his person to wear the mask of Law. A standard of duty must be set before the re-united nation for obedience. The arrangements of Ezekiel, it has been already intimated, stand half-way between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code. They are inspired by the conviction that the holiness of Israel—its solemn relation to Yahweh—must be guarded from every danger that may violate its purity. So he draws the picture of the ancient land divided anew; the holy mount surrounded by the holy territory of the priests; the holy house upon the holy mount; the holy men to serve the holy house. It was reserved for a later group of writers still to project this picture back into the age of Moses. Ezekiel had promised that Yahweh would make his 'dwelling' over his people and would be their God, *Ezek.* 37^{27}. The authors of the Priestly Code embodied this conception in a quasi-historic sanctuary, and displayed the aspirations of prophecy as already realised in the 'Dwelling' erected at Sinai, and guarded by the tribes disposed around it.

Once more, prophecy with priestly aid was undertaking the task of religious reform. On the one hand are the ideal visions of a temple reared by the converging gifts of kings, destined to be a house of prayer for all nations. On the other is the sordid reality of a restoration which revived little but the old difficulties. On the spot, amid ruined homes, a debt-stricken population, a hostile environment, in spite of the rare summons of some prophetic voice, it was impossible to idealise. In Babylonia, where the sacred traditions were all that remained to feed the exiles' life, a deep attachment to the national literature could more easily produce a new programme for the future in the shape of a delineation of the past. The Deuteronomic law was insufficient; it belonged to a polity that was no more. New elements had risen into importance; new ideas, especially the sense of national sinfulness, now needed expression. To meet this demand, to infuse into Israel's relation to Yahweh a solemn awe which should keep it for ever faithful to the sacred bond, was the aim of the Levitical legislation first promulgated under Ezra and Nehemiah.

The fundamental principle of the Priestly Code is laid down in one of its oldest sections in the sublime command 'Be ye holy, for I, Yahweh your God, am holy,' *Lev.* 19^2. It is plain at once that the idea of Israel's holiness here expands from the older notion of Yahweh's consecrated property into a much higher significance. Formerly, Israel had been holy as belonging to Yahweh. But Yahweh

could not be holy as belonging to Israel. Yahweh was holy through the transcendence of his nature above everything earthly and unclean, and further above all the intermediate heavenly powers. Yahweh's holiness, therefore, involved the totality of his attributes as Deity. But when it was made a goal for human endeavour, it evidently bears a more special sense. It is limited to those moral elements in the divine nature with which man has kin. The holiness required of Israel is to penetrate all life. In one aspect it is expressed in an immense number of ritual ordinances, often of the most minute and tiresome character, all intended to secure the strictest purity at once of person and of conduct. In another it rose to the loftiest perception of the true basis of all social relations. If the Deuteronomists had formulated the supreme demand of all religion, 'Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thy heart,' the Holiness-legislation now summed up human duty in the second and consequent principle, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' *Lev.* 19^{18}.

It is not then surprising that the Priestly Code should present what seem at first sight the most glaring contradictions under a common name. On the one side is its whole scheme of holy things,—vessels, robes, furniture, and sanctuary; its holy persons,—the lower Levites, the superior priests, with the high priest as unique representative of the entire people; its holy days of festival and solemnity, culminating in the great annual propitiation, which stood out afterwards in such

prominence from the whole year that it could bear the title of 'The Day.' Does this materialise an elevated and spiritual conception? On the other hand is the picture of the Holy God symbolically dwelling in his chosen Israel's midst. He demands that his people shall resemble him; and what has this to do with special objects, seasons, men? The two views were no doubt fundamentally inconsistent; yet one was for a time necessary to the other. The Law was the vehicle through which the truths of the higher Prophecy were preserved and adapted to the national life. The framers of the Levitical Code did what the Isaiahs had been unable to do; but without the Isaiahs they could not have done it. By the labours of Ezra and his fellow-workers Yahwism was consolidated and sent forth upon a new career. It is the eternal glory of Prophecy to have discerned the far-off vision of a universal spiritual faith; but its heralds could only connect their future with their present by divine revolutions which never took place. The Law endeavoured to bring their principles of the universal Deity of Yahweh, his spiritual nature and his righteous rule, into direct application to the circumstances of a community still in danger of frittering away the positive gains of prophetic thought. It thus accomplished what Prophecy had been unable practically to achieve. In the piety of the Psalms we see the blossom of its idea of personal holiness. The 'Saints' so full of trust and love, waiting for Yahweh to show them the path of life; the poor

and meek, patient under suffering, and faithful through the direst persecution,—these are the holy people nurtured under the Law. Here is the root of the tenacity of Judaism, its stay through an age-long passion such as no other people has endured. In another sense than that of the typologist, the Law doubtless contained both shell and kernel. The shell might be hard and rigid; but it guarded the spiritual power of the true faith within, till the hour was ripe for it to burst forth into new life. Then the Law gave way again to Prophetism in the still nobler form of the Gospel. Its essential aim after the divine ideal 'Be ye holy, for I, Yahweh your God, am holy,' was set free for ever from the limitations of ancient ritual, and transfigured into the final goal of all religion, 'Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.'

LECTURE IV.

CHANGED VIEWS OF PROPHECY

'THE Law' presents itself to us in the light of modern criticism as the product of many centuries of religious growth. The collection of its constituent elements into a sacred canon may be said to have begun with the solemn adoption of the 'book of the Law' by Josiah and the assembled representatives of priesthood and people in 621 B.C., and to have been completed some time after the solemn promulgation of the Levitical code (according to the received date) in 444, under Ezra and Nehemiah. No such unity binds together 'the Prophets,' whose writings are repeatedly named beside 'the Law' in the New Testament.[1]

I.

In the arrangement of the Hebrew Scriptures, this group includes much more than our modern nomenclature would imply. We are so accustomed to associate the idea of prediction with that of

[1] For instance, *Matt.* 5^{17}, 7^{12}, 22^{40}, etc.

prophecy, that we learn at first with surprise that the Jews reckoned among 'the Prophets' the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. From their place in the canon these were designated 'the former Prophets,' while the four books which followed, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and 'the Twelve,' were correspondingly termed 'the latter Prophets.' Daniel, which, in our Old Testament, stands next to Ezekiel, was not included by the Palestinian Jews among 'the Prophets' at all.

The first historical trace of this order is found in the catalogue of 'famous men,' whose praises are recited by Jesus the son of Sirach at the close of his book of Wisdom (commonly known as Ecclesiasticus). After the commemoration of Joshua, the Judges, Samuel, and the heroes of the earlier monarchy, he passes to Hezekiah, Josiah, and the great catastrophe which befel the 'chosen city.' In this long series he mentions 'Isaiah the prophet' in such a way as to show that he was acquainted with the present arrangement of the prophecies by which the consoling strains of chap. 40 and its successors followed the narratives in 36-38 (*Ecclus* $48^{18\text{-}25}$). Jeremiah and Ezekiel are in due course specified, and the writer then prays,

> Moreover the twelve prophets,
> May their strength flourish out of their places:
> Who recovered Jacob to health,
> And restored him by confidence of hope.[1]

[1] See the translation of Dr. Neubauer and Mr. Cowley from the recently discovered Hebrew text, *Ecclus* 49^{10}.

The order of the Hebrew books, then, which is still cherished in the Synagogue, was already established in the days of the Son of Sirach, about 180 B.C. How long it had existed in his time it is difficult to say. There are grave reasons for connecting some important passages in the prophetic writings with the campaigns by which Alexander the Great finally overthrew the Persian power (333 B.C.), and carried into the East the mighty influence of Greece. And when, in the middle of the third century, the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt desired a translation of their scriptures into the language of their commerce and their culture, the forms of some of the books, available in Alexandria, were markedly different from those in which they have been preserved in the Palestinian tradition. The curious omissions and transpositions in Joshua, Samuel, and Jeremiah, seem only explicable on the assumption that the text was not then definitely fixed; and though certainty is beyond our reach, it is in the highest degree probable that it was not till towards the year 200 B.C. that the prophetic canon was practically settled.[1] But not even then were its component parts ever welded into a whole like 'the Law,' though the Book of Isaiah became a sort of depository for prophetic writings of various dates, and similar peculiarities on a lesser scale may be traced in other collections, like those under the names of Jeremiah and Zechariah.

[1] See Bishop Ryle's essay on *The Canon of the Old Testament* (1892), chap. v.

The following sketch will deal only with the four 'latter' books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve. No less change, perhaps, has passed over our view of 'the Prophets' than that which has affected our conception of 'the Law,' and the causes are similar. Many interpretations of the significance of prophecy have been possible. By placing the historical records of Israel from the Conquest to the Fall of Jerusalem in one group with the records of the prophetic teaching, the framers of the Jewish Canon indicated their belief that there was a certain community of thought between the two. The past had a prophetic meaning, as well as the future. In other words, the essence of prophecy did not lie exclusively in its declarations of 'things to come.' On the other hand, the quotations from the Prophetic Canon in the Gospels naturally led Christian theologians to dwell on 'the witness of the Old Testament to Christ'; and a series of interpretations somewhat resembling those propounded by the typologists for the Mosaic institutions were applied to the personages, real or ideal, in the prophetic discourses. From another side, analogies were freely suggested with secular history. The high value which Mr. J. S. Mill ascribed to the prophets as the effective forces of progress in the ancient Hebrew state,[1] is well known. With more emphasis, but less accuracy, M. Darmesteter designated their literary remains as 'the collection of the manifestoes of a series of re-

[1] *Representative Government*, 2nd ed. pp. 41-42.

ligious and political tribunes.'[1] M. Renan compared some of Jeremiah's contemporaries 'to those radical journalists who make government impossible'; and thought it not below either his own dignity or that of his subject to liken the priest of Anathoth in the temple at Jerusalem, wearing the yoke by which he prefigured the enslavement of the doomed city beneath Nebuchadrezzar, to a Parisian publicist traversing the boulevards with a horse-collar round his neck, and proclaiming, in July 1870, the impending victory of Prussia.[2] Amid such diversities the only clue to the truth lies in a just estimate of the literary, the historical, and the religious elements which the prophetic writings combine. The modern spirit sums this up in the demand that they shall be read in connexion with the events and ideas of their time.

II.

The doctrine of prophecy which prevailed in the first half of the last century undoubtedly laid the chief stress on the aspect of prediction. History did but unroll a succession of incidents to justify the ancient seers. The fulfilment of prophecy was treated as a leading part of the 'evidences' of Christianity, and so popular did the argument become that the treatise of Dr. Alexander Keith (1791-1880), entitled *Evidence for the Truth of the*

[1] *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, p. 122.

[2] *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, vol. iii. 277, 333.

Christian Religion derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy, which pursued the argument down to the accomplishment of the curse on Ham (*Gen.* 9^{25}) in the negro-slavery of America, reached its fortieth edition in 1873. A more refined form of this plea was presented by Canon Liddon in his well-known Bampton Lectures on *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*[1] The principle of the organic unity of Scripture here received emphatic assertion. Beneath the mere surface appearance of the Bible as 'a large collection of heterogeneous writings,' 'beneath the differences of style, of language, and of method, which are undeniably prominent in the Sacred Books, and which appear so entirely to absorb the attention of a merely literary observer, a deeper insight will discover in Scripture such manifest unity of drift and purpose, both moral and intellectual, as to imply the continuous action of a Single Mind.' Dr. Liddon accordingly defended what he called 'the world-wide practice of quoting from any one book of Scripture in illustration of the mind of any other book.' 'The Church of Christ,' he affirmed, 'has ever believed her Bible to be throughout so emphatically the handiwork of the Eternal Spirit, that it is no absurdity in Christians to cite Moses as foreshadowing the teaching of St. Paul and St. John.' To this view the Authorised Version bears continuous testimony in its chapter headings and its marginal references. Thus *Gen.* 3^{15} 'it shall

[1] First preached before the University of Oxford, 1866, 14th ed. 1890, Lect. II.

bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,' often described as the *Protevangelium,* was explained by *Rom.* 16^{20} 'and the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly';[1] the serpent of Eden was identified with the devil;[2] while a further reference to *Rev.* $12^{7\ 17}$ suggested a fulfilment of the promise in the Messianic victory of Michael over the Dragon who was cast out to make way for 'the kingdom of our God and the power of his Christ.' To *Gen.* 12 was prefixed the interpretation 'God calleth Abraham and blesseth him with a promise of Christ.' The mysterious Shiloh whose advent is announced by the dying Jacob, *Gen.* 49^{10}, is discerned again in the 'Branch' out of the root of Jesse *Is.* 11^{1}, in the 'anointed prince' of *Dan.* 9^{25}, till he is finally presented to human eyes in the person of Jesus riding into Jerusalem, and acclaimed by the multitude as 'Son of David,' *Matt.* 21^{9}. In a similar manner the star which Balaam beholds rise out of Jacob, *Num.* 24^{17}, points onwards to the star which led the Magi to Bethlehem, *Matt.* 2^{2}, and found its impersonation in Jesus 'the bright and morning star,' *Rev.* 22^{16}.

Under this system of interpretation it was not surprising that David, *Psalm* 110, should give a summary description of 'the kingdom, the priest-

[1] In the International Critical Commentary Prof. Sanday and Mr. Headlam make no allusion to the passage in Genesis, which may, however, have been in the background in the apostle's mind. The final 'shortly' probably refers to the swift approach of Messiah's advent.

[2] 'Mystically, Satan and all his servants,' says Dr. Harold Browne, *Speaker's Comm.*, on *Gen.* 3^{15}.

hood, the conquest and the passion of Christ,' or that the book of Isaiah nearly from end to end should rehearse in advance the incidents of Messiah's career: 7^{10}, 'Ahaz, having liberty to choose a sign, and refusing it, hath for a sign Christ promised': 9^{1}, 'What joy shall be in the midst of afflictions by the kingdom and birth of Christ': 42^{1}, 'The office of Christ, graced with meekness and constancy': 49^{1}, 'Christ, being sent to the Jews, complaineth of them; [5] He is sent to the Gentiles with gracious promises': 50^{1}, 'Christ showeth that the dereliction of the Jews is not to be imputed to him': 53^{1}, 'The prophet, complaining of incredulity, excuseth the scandal of the cross': 63^{1}, 'Christ sheweth who he is, [2] what his victory over his enemies, [7] and what his mercy toward his church; [10] in his just wrath he remembereth his free mercy.' When this method was continually forced on the attention of the readers of the Authorised Version, it was still possible for the distinguished Anglican apologist to repeat, in the latest edition which he lived to issue, his courageous assertion that 'no amount of captious ingenuity will destroy the substantial fact that the leading features of our Lord's human manifestation were announced to the world some centuries before He actually came among us.' How many Biblical theologians of the present day could subscribe that declaration?

III.

The change is due to causes similar to those which have wrought a revolution in our interpretation of the successive strata now recognised in 'the Law.' Literary and historical criticism have in this field also supported each other, and co-operated in the result. Two books in particular have received new explanations under their influence, those bearing the names of Isaiah and Daniel. Isaiah, in the language of Jerome, was 'rather an Evangelist than a prophet'; and did not Daniel announce the very year of Messiah's birth, and describe his heavenly Advent in clouds of glory? Round these fierce battle has been fought owing to the repeated allusions to them in the Gospels; though the sound of the strife is now far off, and the ground of controversy has shifted from questions of authorship and date to the significance of their issue for the modern conceptions of the person of Jesus, with which we are not concerned here. In each case the final judgment is reached by numerous lines of argument, which are found to converge upon a common conclusion.

The keen insight of the mediæval rabbi Ibn Ezra, who detected the signs of post-Mosaic documents in the Pentateuch,[1] divined with no less clearness the secret of the last twenty-seven chapters of *Isaiah*. But the doubts which he obscurely expressed did not again suggest themselves to the commentators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was not

[1] See Lect. III, p. 110.

until Bishop Lowth's version was translated into German by Koppe (1779-81) that the first hint was raised by modern criticism concerning the later origin of *Is.* 40-66. Once started, the new view rapidly gathered strength, and received admirable handling from J. G. Eichhorn in his rendering of the Hebrew Prophets, 1816-19. Eichhorn's main idea was that the prophetic writings should be studied in their historical order, and he accordingly arranged the several books, and their constituent elements, in what he supposed to be their true time-succession. Beginning with Joel, about 790-80 B.C., he marshalled the whole series in ordered array, down to the prophecies of Daniel in the Maccabean age. In this 'goodly company' of voices, an entire chorus was assigned out of *Isaiah* to the age of the Captivity and the Restoration. The 'fragment' hypothesis was then in the ascendant in the treatment of the Pentateuch, and the discourses in *Is.* 40-66 were distributed among a number of 'Unknowns,' some in Babylonia, and some in Jerusalem. A more solid basis of criticism was supplied by the great lexicographer and grammarian, Gesenius, in his translation and commentary, 1820-21. From that time the belief in the composite character of the book steadily won its way, first in Germany and then, after half a century, in this country. In 1863 it was still possible for the representative of ecclesiastical tradition lightly to dismiss the band of critics who confronted him. 'The catalogue of authors who gainsay Isaiah's authorship of this second part, is, in point of num-

bers, of critical ability, and of profound Hebrew scholarship, sufficiently imposing. Nevertheless, when we come to inquire into their grounds of objection, we soon cease to attach much value to this formidable array of authorities.'[1] A later generation has not hesitated to reverse that verdict. In describing Bunsen's Biblical Researches in *Essays and Reviews,* Dr. Rowland Williams pointed to the insertion of four chapters (36-39) concerning Hezekiah 'from the histories of the kings,' with which the words and deeds of the elder Isaiah apparently closed. 'It does not follow,' he added pregnantly, 'that all the prophecies arranged earlier in the book are from his lips; probably they are not': but the argument for the Babylonian origin of the chapters which delineated the stooping of Nebo, and the fall of the proud city of the Euphrates, was irresistible.

By this time Ewald had already followed Eichhorn with a work arranged on a similar method,[2] but with a far wider and withal more penetrating survey of the historical field.[3] In this great commentary, the successive discourses, often rendered with a pas-

[1] The Rev. Edgar Huxtable, sub-dean of Wells, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. 1 p. 887.

[2] First ed. 1840-1; 2nd ed. 1867-8; English translation, *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, by J. Frederick Smith, 5 vols. 1875-80.

[3] That he was conscious of a debt to Eichhorn, may be inferred from his advice to the late Rev. John Owen, who was curate to Dr. Rowland Williams when Ewald was a visitor at the vicarage at Broadchalke. Ewald addressed him suddenly one day (so Mr. Owen related to me in after years) in his abrupt, oracular style. 'Young man,' said he, 'read Eichhorn.'

sionate vehemence which carried the reader along almost breathless, were enveloped in expositions sometimes full of glowing mist, yet always planted somewhere in an actual situation as their point of departure. However far the prophet's view might range, it had definite centre in place and time in the midst of Israel's vicissitudes, and his language was primarily designed for the people among whom he lived. With this firm foothold on reality, Ewald proceeded to distribute the contents of the book of Isaiah, beginning with the oracles called forth by the position of Judah under Ahaz, past the great catastrophe which (after three years' siege) overwhelmed Samaria in 722 B.C., to the great group dealing with the impending Assyrian advance against Judah, the intrigues of politicians for the Egyptian alliance, and the final defiance of Sennacherib. To these he added, as a glorious swan-song of the prophet's latest years, the marvellous delineation in chap. 19 of the union of the three powers—the two great world-empires of Assyria and Egypt, so long hostile —with Israel in their midst, not crushed, but in brotherly alliance and religious fellowship. This accounted for most of the prophetic material in 1-39, important exceptions, however, being found in 12^{1-6}, 13^{2}-14^{23}, 21^{1-10}, 23^{15-18}, 24-27, and 34-35; some of these passages being grouped with 40-66 under the general heading of the Exile, while one considerable section, 24-27, was placed after the Return. What criteria were available for such a partition?

There is, in the first place, the evidence of

historical situation. Under the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah the political rivalry of the two kingdoms, Israel and Judah, passes before us. There is the invasion by the allied kings from Samaria and Damascus,—the advance of the Assyrians and the retreat of the intruding powers to defend their own threatened territory. There is the infatuation of the doomed city of the north; and on its fall, there is the danger of an immediate attack by the victor on Jerusalem itself. At every turn the prophet looks direct on contemporary reality in his own land. But in the sequel all is changed. There is the same immediate gaze on actual events; but the place and time are different. Assyria has disappeared. The scene is in Babylonia; Jerusalem has fallen; the temple has been burned; the people are captive. But a liberator is already on the way. A conqueror is advancing from the north with irresistible might: it is Cyrus, Yahweh's anointed (Messiah 45[1]), who will set Israel free. In impassioned strains the exiles are summoned to 'go forth'; the wilderness produces forest trees to give them shade; and on the ancient hill the sanctuary rises from its ruins in a blaze of glory.

Associated with this vast divergence of external detail are new prophetic themes unheard before. Consolations for the suffering and depressed; the reiterated proof of Yahweh's deity from the majesty of nature, from the events of history and the fulfilment of prophetic anticipation; the mysterious personality of the Servant of Yahweh, at one time

described, at another dramatically soliloquising; the degradation of Babylon and the majestic splendour of the holy city; the future worship of Yahweh on a new earth, under a new heaven;—these take the place of the earlier denunciations of popular pride in Zion's wealth and security, warnings of the unexpected character of 'Yahweh's day,' bitter scorn for a 'Sodom-people' and 'Gomorrah-rulers,' and vehement condemnations of social greed, class injustice, and religious self-satisfaction. The ideal king (Ewald had no hesitation in ascribing the great figures of *Is.* 9^6 and 11^{1-5} to the Isaiah of Jerusalem) disappears; and in his place is the prophet-people, destined to be the bearers of Yahweh's religion to the nations of the world.

Once more, new thoughts are expressed in a new manner. The devotional idiom of the two sets of prophecies is no less different than their peculiarities of style. The great roll of exalted oratory; the repetitions of Yahweh's assertions of his Deity, 'I am Yahweh, and there is none else,' 'I am the first, and I am the last,' 'I am thy God, thy Saviour,' 'I am he (the same)'; the combinations of clauses expanding the divine attributes as 'Creator,' 'Former,' 'Saviour' or 'Deliverer,' 'Redeemer'; the frequent use of figures drawn from human emotion; the duplication of phrases, 'comfort ye, comfort ye,' 'I, even I,' etc., 'awake, awake,' 'depart ye, depart ye,' etc.; the bold personifications of Zion or Babylon; the numerous allusions to ancient mythological conceptions;—all give to the discourses

in 40-66 a distinctive utterance which cannot be mistaken. Much of the vocabulary of Isaiah is absent; while on the other hand 'a number of words and phrases appear in these chapters which are either never found in the first part of the book, or are only found in those chapters which bear independent traces of belonging to a different age'[1]

By such arguments was Stanley led to follow Ewald; and to the second volume of his *Lectures on the Jewish Church* (1866) he appended a brief statement of the general evidence. The subject was not, indeed, handled critically in this country for the first time. It had been discussed with candour and moderation by Sir Edward Strachey in his treatise on *Hebrew Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib* (1853); and though then rejected, it secured a modified recognition when the work was re-issued in 1874. It had been presented in general terms in Higginson's *Spirit of the Bible*[2]: it was adopted with ample learning by the Rev. George Vance Smith in a small and little known volume, *The Prophecies Relating to Nineveh and the Assyrians*, 1857. In the *Introduction to the Old Testament* (vol. iii., 1863) Dr. Samuel Davidson had already expounded the German view with cordial assent. Parallel with Stanley's brief exposition came the learned version of Dr. Rowland Williams in the first volume of his *Hebrew Prophets* (1866), where the writings of Isaiah of Jerusalem were sifted out from the general mass, though the existing order was

[1] Driver, *Isaiah* ('Men of the Bible'), p. 197. [2] Vol. i., 1853, pp. 490-9.

maintained. Vainly did English apologetic seek to restore the traditional conception. Prof. Cheyne, then fresh from Göttingen, began his long labours on the book with suggestions for textual correction (1868), and followed up these with his charming volume entitled *Isaiah Chronologically Arranged* (1870[1]). Matthew Arnold produced a version of *Is.* 40-66 as a Bible-reading for schools, under the title of *The Great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration* (1872[2]). The struggle, in fact, was over. The victory of Biblical study in the ecclesiastical courts left the way open to argument, and in this case the argument was particularly clear. The brilliant and sympathetic volumes of the Rev. (now Prof.) G. A. Smith in the 'Expositor's Bible' (1890) familiarised a wider circle of readers with the general critical result, to which Prof. Driver had by this time given his weighty sanction.[3] It is assumed by Prof. Sanday, when discoursing on *Inspiration* (1893). It is fully exhibited in the excellent volumes on *Isaiah* contributed by Prof. Skinner to the 'Cambridge Bible.'[4] With differences of detail, it is adopted in each of the two modern Dictionaries of the Bible. Even the venerable work edited by Dr.

[1] Subsequent publications were *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 2 vols., 1880; 'Isaiah' in *Enc. Brit.*[9], 1880; *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895; 'Isaiah' in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Test.*, 1898; 'Isaiah' in *Enc. Bibl.*, 1901.

[2] To this was added in 1883 a similar version of the prophecies of Isaiah of Jerusalem.

[3] In *Isaiah* ('Men of the Bible,' 1888) and the well-known *Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test.*, 1891.

[4] Vol. i. *Is.* 1-39, 1896; vol. ii. *Is.* 40-66, 1898.

William Smith, when its first volume was re-issued in 1893, conceded (in the person of Dr. C. H. H. Wright) that older prophecies (regarded as Isaian) had again and again received comments and expansions at the hand of a 'post-exilian enlarger.' And in one after another of the later treatises on the significance of prophecy,—to name but one of the most recent, *The Hope of Israel*, by the Rev. F. H. Woods (1896),—the modern view is frankly accepted on the principle that 'a prophecy must have some intelligible relation to the events of the prophet's time' (p. 47).

IV.

This principle has operated with even more potent effect in the case of the Book of Daniel. That book does not belong to the 'Prophets' according to the traditional arrangement of the Hebrew Scriptures, and that fact has been itself held to confirm the belief that it was not in existence when the Canon of Prophecy was closed about 200 B C. The criticism of Daniel, indeed, began at an early date, when the philosopher Porphyry devoted part of his sojourn in Sicily (267-270 A.D.) to composing a series of discourses against the Christians. In the twelfth of these he pointed to certain peculiarities in the work which connected it with the second century B.C. 'The history,' he said, 'is true up to the date of Antiochus Epiphanes,[1] and false afterwards';

[1] 176-164 B.C.

therefore the book was written in his time.[1] The critic was silenced; Porphyry's book was burned by order of the Emperor Theodosius II. in 435; but in the seventeenth century Hobbes and Spinoza (who also, as we have seen, anticipated important modern views about the Pentateuch) both expressed doubts of the prophet's authorship. In 1783 Corrodi (in Germany) openly assigned the book to the age of Antiochus; and every decade added fresh support to his plea. It received the weighty adhesion of Gesenius and Eichhorn; and Bleek and De Wette were of one mind with them. English Biblical study was of course slow to move, but it has already been noted that Dr. Arnold in 1840 frankly declared in correspondence that the pretended prophecy about the kings of Greece and Persia was mere history, like the poetical prophecies in Virgil and elsewhere.[2] Dr. Arnold died, and his biographer could not be prosecuted for publishing another man's words. But in 1861 Dr. Rowland Williams was arraigned in the Court of Arches[3] for denying that the book was written by Daniel, and three years later Dr. Pusey poured forth all his learning in its defence.[4] The preface to this famous volume exhibits so clearly the difficulties which Biblical students then had to meet, that a few sentences may be here presented:

'Others who wrote in defence of the faith engaged in larger

[1] This is the account of Jerome, at the end of the fourth century. Several eminent fathers replied to Porphyry, but their treatises have not survived.

[2] *Life*, letter cxix.; see Lect. I, p. 24.

[3] See Lect. I, p. 31. [4] *Daniel the Prophet*, 1864.

subjects; I took for my province one more confined but definite issue. I selected the book of Daniel, because unbelieving critics considered their attacks upon it to be one of their greatest triumphs. The exposure of the weakness of some ill-alleged point of evidence has often thrown suspicion on a whole faith. The exposure of the weakness of criticism where it thought itself most triumphant, would, I hoped, shake the confidence of the young in their would-be misleaders. True, disbelief of Daniel had become an axiom of the unbelieving critical school. Only they mistook the result of unbelief for the victory of criticism. They overlooked the historical fact that the disbelief had been antecedent to the criticism. Disbelief had been the parent not the offspring of their criticism; their starting-point, not the winning-post, of their course.'

This spirit of accusation was rebuked with great courage and dignity by a younger scholar, the Rev. J. J. Stewart Perowne,[1] who contributed an article upon the book to the first number of the *Contemporary Review*.[2] While expressing his continued adhesion to the traditional view, and his admiration for Dr. Pusey's vast erudition, he felt constrained to add, 'We can express nothing but disapprobation both of the temper in which the book is written, and of the entire perversion of all critical principles by which, in our judgment, it is marked.'

Once more, the argument might be pursued along various lines. There was the evidence from language, the evidence from the peculiar character of the predictions, and the evidence derived from secular sources as to the historical statements.

[1] Afterwards editor of the series of the *Cambridge Bible*, and Bishop of Worcester.

[2] January, 1866.

To begin with, a large part of the book is not written in Hebrew at all, but in the language commonly known as Aramaic (2^{4b}-7). This was not the speech of Babylon in the sixth century B.C.; it is a Western dialect, of the type spoken in and about Palestine.[1] Moreover it is impregnated with Persian words, of which there is no trace in the Babylonian inscriptions of the age of Nebuchadrezzar and his successors. And not only so, it contains the names of three Greek musical instruments, the *kitharis* or harp, the *psaltêrion* or psaltery, and the *symphonia* or dulcimer ($3^{5\ 7\ 15}$). But if the Babylonians, it was asked, could move about the great winged bulls, why could they not have imported a few musical instruments? In the sixth century, however, the movement ran from East to West, and it was Greece that was enriched by Babylonian culture. Two special indications connected these names with a later day. The *psaltery* appeared in Daniel as a *psantery;* and this change from *l* to *n* corresponds with that noted by Gregory of Corinth (bishop and grammarian, about 1150 A.D.) as characteristic of the Macedonian dialect[2]; while the *symphonia* is first mentioned as a musical instrument (in contrast with its meaning 'harmony') in a description by Polybius of the festivities at the court of Antiochus

[1] Driver, *Daniel*, in 'Cambridge Bible,' 1901, p. lvii.

[2] So Gesenius in his great Thesaurus. On the other hand see Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 28, whom Rowland Williams corrects in his introduction to the excellent exposition of Mr. Desprez, *Daniel* (1865), p.xviii. This view is still held by good authorities, e.g., Kamphausen in *Encycl. Bibl.*, i. 1009.

Epiphanes.[1] The evidence of language, then, points to the Greek age, as clearly as the use of terms like 'legion,' 'centurion,' 'census,' 'denarius,' in the Gospels, points to Rome.

But, again, the famous eleventh chapter not only depicts the rise of Alexander the Great, and the confusion that followed his death [3-4], it proceeds to detail the history of two kingdoms, that of the Seleucidæ in the north, in Syria, and the Ptolemies in Egypt in the south. The events are rapidly traced to the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164): his evacuation of Egypt under the urgency of C. Popillius Laenas and the other Roman legates in 168, followed by his return to Antioch and the beginning of the persecution of the Jews, is narrated in [30-36]. The writer then passes swiftly to the final catastrophe; he is probably cognisant (8^{14}) of the purification of the temple in December, 165; he pictures the overthrow of the blasphemer just at the height of his power after a vast campaign of conquest, when his pavilion is planted between the Mediterranean and the temple-mount, 11^{40-45}; but at this point, his vision fails him, Antiochus died at Tabæ in Persia in the summer of 164. If the whole previous survey was really prophetic, why was not the inspiration maintained accurately to the end? And what parallel could be found for such exact anticipations as (for instance) the defeat of Antiochus

[1] See the passages quoted (from Athenæus) by Driver, *Daniel* (Cambridge Bible, 1901), p. 39. On the general question the articles on 'Music' in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, and *Encycl. Bibl.* may be consulted.

the Great at Magnesia by the Roman 'captain' ([18] RV margin) Lucius Cornelius Scipio, in 190, or the mission of the 'exactor' Heliodorus [20], treasurer of Seleucus IV. (187-75)? Well might Dr. Thirlwall, who never lost the sense of the historian in the bishop, in writing to Mr. Perowne concerning his article, say [1]:—

'No part of Dr. Pusey's argument appears to me less satisfactory than that in which he attempts to meet the objections grounded on the minuteness of the details in the eleventh chapter. It ought not to be denied that *such* a forestalling of history by prophecy is absolutely unique in the Old Testament, and I believe that the fact will always be felt by intelligent readers as a very serious difficulty; that which weighs most of all against the genuineness of the book.'

When the Bishop wrote, it was still thought possible by competent students to harmonise (by means of various hypotheses) the statements of the book concerning Belshazzar, the fall of Babylon, and the accession of Darius the Mede, with the narratives of secular history. But the discovery of the cuneiform tablets in which the victors tell their own story, makes it finally impossible to believe that the author of Daniel was contemporary with the scenes which he describes. Prof. Sayce, who has earnestly pleaded for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch on the ground of the authority of Christ, quietly sets that august sanction aside as he expounds the testimony of the conqueror himself.[2] Belshazzar was

[1] *Letters*, etc. (1881), p. 248.

[2] *The 'Higher Criticism' and the Verdict of the Monuments*, 1894, chap. xi.

not the son of Nebuchadrezzar ($5^{2\,11\ 13\,18}$), but of Nabunaid, himself separated by various changes of dynasty from the great monarch. Nor was Belshazzar on the throne when Babylon was taken[30]; his father Nabunaid still reigned, and survived the disaster. And the captor was not Darius the Mede,[31] who never existed; it was Gobryas, the general of the Persian Cyrus. The gates were opened to him; he entered the city with his troops, and there was no resistance; in contrast to the ruin which befel the temple at Jerusalem, the daily services in the magnificent sanctuary of Bel Merodach were never interrupted. Business still continued to be done under the name of Nabunaid; Cyrus did not arrive for three months later; and a series of contract tablets shows that the ordinary operations of trade were unaffected by the war. The proof is decisive that the author of Daniel was remote both in time and place from the reign of Nebuchadrezzar and the banks of the Euphrates; and the presumption becomes then exceedingly strong that he lived in the age of the Maccabees. Further recital of the advance of the critical view is needless. This result also is duly registered in the modern Bible dictionaries,[1] and is one of the accepted issues of the 'historical method.'

The process of which two conspicuous examples have been briefly sketched, has not of course been

[1] An attempt is still made in the second edition of Smith's *Dict.*, vol. i. (1893), to evade the force of the cuneiform evidence by vague general assertion which is absolutely worthless.

confined to them. The whole range of the prophetic literature has been scrutinised with the utmost care. Traces of incessant editorial manipulation have been discovered in various forms; in the insertion of shorter or longer passages; in the expansion of older oracles, and the addition of new ones; in the aggregation of prophecies of widely different dates into single collections. The evidence for this conclusion is always substantially the same in kind, though necessarily often varying in amount and force. The book of Joel has been dislodged from its place as the first product of prophetic literature, and is now placed at least in the fourth century in sight of the Greek age. The mysterious group of discourses blended in *Is.* 24-27 finds its best explanation in connexion with the immense social convulsions under Artaxerxes III. (359-339), culminating in the onset of Greece on Persia led by Alexander the Great.[1] Into the writings of Amos, Hosea, Micah, other and later elements have been incorporated (a curious instance is found in the parallel passages *Is.* 2^{2-4} and *Mic.* 4^{1-3}); and the gloom of present distresses is relieved by brighter hopes. Similarly the book of Jeremiah contains passages certainly not from the hand of the prophet; and after standing by the side of Zerubbabel and Joshua in *Zech.* 1-8 (520-518 B.C.) under Darius, the reader is suddenly transported in 9^{13} to an age when Greece has become the great world-power.

[1] So Cheyne, Skinner, and others. Duhm thinks he can trace allusions to Rome and the events of the latter part of the second century B.C.

In all these cases the first aim of the interpreter is to discover the historical situation in which the prophet speaks. There lies the clue to his meaning. This method may, indeed, render many of the applications of prophecy made in the New Testament quite unsuitable.[1] The formula of *Matt.* 1^{22}, 'Now all this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet,'[2] rests on modes of interpretation—the isolation of a verse from its context—which are now abandoned. The study of *Is.* $7^{15\text{-}16}$ shows that the Evangelist's connexion of the promised child in [14] with the birth of Jesus could not have been in the prophet's mind. He is to be born during the invasion by the allied kings of Ephraim and Syria from which Judah was then suffering. His first years will be passed in privation; the crops will be destroyed, the land no longer tilled; only a young cow will be left here and there to supply milk [21-22]; and the curds and wild honey which are to be his food [15], will be a diet of want and not of luxury.[3] But before he reaches years of discretion [16], the territories of the invading

[1] Readers of Dr. Rowland Williams's early volume of sermons, entitled *Rational Godliness*, 1855, will have noted the candid record of the slow movement of his mind. Mr. Woods, *The Hope of Israel*, p. 80, quotes from a letter evoked by the storm which the book excited, 'What Bishop Butler conceded hypothetically, that all prophecies in the Old Testament referred primarily to the Jewish people, kings, or prophets, must in the present state of Bible criticism be accepted as a fact.'

[2] Comp. $2^{15\ 23}$, etc.

[3] There is, however, some doubt whether [15] is original. Budde, on the other hand, *Religion of Israel to the Exile* (1899), p. 149, proposes to strike out [16].

A vast change has thus taken place in our comprehension of these venerable utterances. In what light, then, are they viewed to-day? What is the place of the prophets in the religion of Israel, as it is expressed in the Old Testament? The answer is that with them rather than with the Law lay its informing power; they were the true authors of their

people's faith and hope; and it is justly said that 'in the religious regeneration of Europe prophetism is still one of the forces of the future.'[1]

V.

In its rudest form the prophetism of Israel belongs to a group of religious beliefs and usages that are widely spread all round the globe. Under the palm-groves of West Africa, on the steppes of central and northern Asia, in the forests of North America, the peoples of the lower culture have recognised certain individuals among them as capable of states of inspiration or possession, often induced by music and song, and marked by wondrous insight into the unseen. Such persons manifest mysterious knowledge both of the past and the future. Among higher races—our very word 'prophet' comes to us from the Greeks[2]—these powers sometimes displayed themselves in nobler ways. Tacitus bore testimony to the love of the Teutonic tribes for heroic song, and drew attention to the special part played by women as prophetesses.[3] Characteristic of Scandinavian mythology were the dim figures of the three Norns—prototypes of the three weird sisters who addressed Macbeth—symbols of the Past (Urdr), the Present (Verdandi), and the Future (Skuld). And no less characteristic of early Scandinavian society were the Valas or Völvas

[1] Darmesteter, preface to *Les Prophètes d'Israël*.

[2] Some illustrations of Greek prophetic ideas are given below.

[3] Tac. *Germ.* 2, *Hist.* iv. 61.

(prophetesses), who sang their mystic songs, some of which, dealing with the birth-hour of the world, and high themes of judgment and regeneration, have come down to us from pre-Christian days in the group of poems known as the Wolospa.[1] The ancient Irish bards shared many of the functions commonly assigned to the Druids;[2] they were organised in schools; they underwent long and laborious training; and they, too, produced a special literature, that of the *fis* or vision, and of the *imram* or wandering,[3] in search of the happy land beyond the western sea.—What is it, then, which has given to the prophecy of Israel its incomparable force?

The Hebrew term *nābī'* is derived from a root which is widely spread through the Semitic languages, and appears in the Arabic and Ethiopic on the south, and the Assyro-Babylonian in the north. The Assyrian *nabu* means to call or proclaim; and Nebo, to whose worship the mountain in Moab was probably dedicated, was the prophet, the spokesman, or the herald (it may be) of the great Babylonian deity Marduk. Under what impulses the *nābī'* originally appeared in Israel, cannot be determined with certainty.[4] We see them first parading the

[1] See the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, edited by Vigfusson and Powell (1883), vol. ii. p. 621.

[2] The Gaelic *fāith* or *fâidh* is supposed to be identical with the Latin *vates* (bard), and is sometimes connected with a Sanskrit root meaning 'speak.'

[3] See *The Voyage of Bran*, by Meyer and Nutt (1895).

[4] A valuable antiquarian note tells us, 1 *Sam.* 9[9], that the former name of the *nābī'* was *ro'é* or 'seer.' The editors of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon suppose that the change probably occurred in the times of Elijah.

country with a band of music in the gloomy days of the Philistine oppression (1 *Sam.* 10^{5-10}). They are the organs of a new religious fervour, manifesting itself in excited utterance and demeanour, so that 'prophet' and 'madman' are again and again allied (e.g. 2 *Kings* 9^{11}, *Hos.* 9^{7}, *Jer.* 29^{26}). So swift is the contagion of enthusiasm, that when Saul meets them he is swept away into like ecstasy; and, according to another tradition of the origin of the proverbial question 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' under this potent influence he strips off his robes, and lies naked before Samuel for a day and a night, 1 *Sam.* 19^{20-24}. Whether this was evoked, within the religion of Yahweh, by contact (as many eminent critics have supposed) with some Canaanite influence; whether (as Prof. Cheyne has recently suggested)[1] the hairy mantle and the marks over the eyes which distinguished the prophet, were of North Arabian origin; or whether, as Budde has pleaded,[2] prophetism was really native to Israel, or to a section of the people, perhaps from very ancient times, and awoke from long slumber in the urgent need of a fresh force to throw off the Philistine oppression—these are interesting problems of the historical antecedents of a movement destined to affect all higher religious thought, but they cannot be argued here.[3] What is certain is that the prophets became the impassioned champions of the religion of Yahweh.

[1] *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 3857. [2] *Religion of Israel*, p. 97.

[3] See, for instance, the lectures on *The Prophets of the Old Test.* by Prof. W. Robertson Smith, 2nd ed., 1895.

With this religion were involved, on the one hand, certain powerful ideas of nationality, and on the other certain vivid moral emotions concerned with the obedience of Israel to its God. In one aspect prophetism occupied itself with politics. Gad joins David's band of outlaws in the cave of Adullam; Nathan promotes the accession of Solomon; and tradition assigned to Ahijah a share in the disruption under Jeroboam. In the northern kingdom prophets are numerous at Ahab's court. After Elijah has led the opposition to the Syrian Baal to whose worship queen Jezebel was devoted, the wealth and vigour of the monarchy are the manifest signs of Yahweh's favour, and four hundred prophets, assembled before the royal throne in front of the gate at Samaria, promise Ahab victory in his expedition to Ramoth Gilead (1 *Kings* 22). Elisha instigates the revolution which brings Jehu into power through the massacre of the house of Omri: and in later days Isaiah and Jeremiah are at once the opponents and the confidants of kings. But their political designs are linked with moral and religious ideas which have in them extraordinary capacity of growth. Early tradition told of the rebuke which Nathan administered to David for his crime against Uriah. The fall of Ahab and the miserable fate of his descendants is associated with the dark deed by which Naboth perished. In the struggle with the Syrian Baal, as in the tornado which sweeps away the huge family of the guilty king, there is a certain relentless

ferocity which expresses with terrible intensity what were felt to be the necessities and perils of the situation. At all costs Israel must be preserved in obedience to Yahweh; at all costs the punishment of crime must overtake not only the evil-doer himself but even all who belonged to him.

Under these two deep convictions, that Israel owed unswerving loyalty to Yahweh, and that Yahweh demanded well-doing and chastised sin, prophetic thought began to react upon the ancient traditions. The stories of tribal forefathers, fragments of antique song, snatches of myth and folklore, tales of the sanctuaries, were patiently wrought into systematic shape. A scheme of patriarchal relationships was slowly framed into which other and later material could be incorporated; the figures of Abram, Isaac, Jacob, stood out more clearly; and the divine promise of the land which could not be realised under Egyptian bondage, supplied a kind of higher necessity for the deliverance of Israel by Moses. At Sinai Yahweh bound Israel to him by solemn covenant; and in the union thus effected lay the germ which should expand to embrace the world. It mattered not that the ideas of Yahweh should be often crude and unspiritual; a form of religious conception was supplied into which all experience could be gradually cast; as the outlook widened, the relations of Israel with other nations were defined; dim vistas of the past were by degrees filled with mysterious figures issuing from the dawn of history; until at length a complete connexion was estab-

lished between the tribes in Canaan and the first pair in Eden, and one divine guidance knit the whole together. Such were the contents of the first continuous series of records compiled in Judah early in the ninth century, and known among the Pentateuchal documents as **J**. It brought down Israel's story to the great days of David, whose empire was interpreted as the gift of Yahweh's favour, and supplied a picture of national grandeur after which religious patriotism could again and again aspire. Retold, in Ephraim, on the basis of a theory of revelation which regarded the sacred divine name as first disclosed to Moses at Horeb, the national traditions were incorporated in the narrative and legislation assigned to **E**, whose sympathy with prophecy was indicated by his ascription of the prophetic character to Abraham, *Gen.* 20^{6}, and his delineation of the exalted activity of Moses. These two documents became the depositories of what may be called the Mosaic idea; they enable us to understand the imaginative background of prophetic appeal; they do not, indeed, explain all the elements of the national religion—of the popular expectation of 'Yahweh's day,' for instance, *Amos* 5^{18}, they say nothing—but they illuminate for us the moral and religious atmosphere in which the great Prophecy of the eighth century arose.

The sudden appearance of Amos about 760 B.C., his passionate utterance, his noble literary form, can never be *explained*. The swift succession, Amos,

Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, reminds us of other periods of marked intellectual or artistic activity, when quickening influences have played through the human spirit; the rise of Greek tragedy, of early Italian painting, of Elizabethan drama, has in each case a mystery at its core. As we survey these mighty personalities, the first impression we receive is that of the extraordinary concentration of their spiritual energy, and yet, withal, the variety of their outlook upon life. A whole panorama is spread out before us. The country shepherds and the magnates of the realm,—the homely peasant and the fine ladies of the court,—the sublimities of the desert, the incidents of the vineyard or the farm, and the drunken groups of city priests,—we see and hear them all. The nations around pass and re-pass across the stage; and one great terror draws steadily nearer, as the Assyrian advances with ruin and devastation in his train. So the work of the prophets has its social aspect, and they pass sentence on the tyranny of the rich over the poor, the corruption of luxury, the extravagance of fashion, the maladministration of justice, the cruel eviction of defaulters, the shameless aggregation of estates, the crimes of the ministers of the altar at Shechem, who are apparently denounced by Hosea for murdering the pilgrims to their sanctuary (6^9).[1] It has its political side, when Isaiah denounces state intrigues, declaims against rotten alliances, flings out bitter warnings of the worthlessness of fortifications and the impotence

[1] The state of the text, however, makes the interpretation uncertain.

of munitions of war, appeals for confidence in Yahweh, and at the crisis of Sennacherib's invasion is justified in his sublime impracticableness.

But at every turn the social and political interests pass into the moral and religious, or rather are animated and controlled by them. What had been long implicit in the higher Yahwism, now begins to receive noble expression, and is applied with fearless and penetrating power. On the one hand are the ancient sanctuaries where the worship of the local Baals had often been so strangely blended with that of Yahweh himself. These are Israel's 'lovers,' wooing her with wealth of corn and wine, of wool and flax. From these the guilty nation must be withdrawn; the festal days must cease; and in solitude and suffering she must learn once more reverence and loyalty to her true Lord. But there is also a wrong worship of Yahweh. There is the impotence of the image, for what wood or stone will avail to help in Yahweh's great day? And there is the immoral confidence of the formalist, who thinks that punctual dues and stated attendance will satisfy the claims of the heavenly justice and the loving-kindness of Yahweh. In both kingdoms piety was assiduous, and crowds trod the temple courts. Assured of the divine favour through the outward tokens of prosperity, they could not understand that there was anything amiss. They look for a 'day' of triumph, it will prove a day of doom; they expect Yahweh in a blaze of glory, it will turn into blackest night. That connexion with Yahweh of which they

boasted, led straight not to national exaltation but to national judgment.

This was the fundamental difference between the prophetic and the popular view. The unspiritual nationalism argued much as Jephthah had argued with the Ammonites: 'You hold what your god Chemosh can keep for you; we hold what our god Yahweh secures for us.'[1] The successes of Jeroboam II., which again extended the boundary of the Northern Kingdom, were the mark of Yahweh's good-will; if wealth poured into Judah, Yahweh was satisfied with his people. Why, then, should they not go on as they were? Was he not with them visibly, *Amos* 5^{14}? It is probable that many of the lower-minded prophets nourished themselves on this belief. The tie which Yahweh had himself formed with Israel, he was, in this aspect, pledged to maintain. Its continued safety was essential to his own good name. This singular conception of a kind of reciprocity between a people and its god, which lies in the background of more than one passage in the traditions of the Mosaic days,[2] the higher prophecy flung scornfully to the winds. Far above Israel and its neighbour peoples rises the sublime figure of Yahweh, transcending earth and sky with illimitable power. No mountain-glade or ocean-deep can hide the fugitives from him. From the top of heaven to the lowest pit of Sheol his hand can always reach them. This is the majestic being who says to Israel, 'You only have I known of all the

[1] *Judges* 11^{24}. [2] *Exod.* 32^{12}, *Num.* 14^{13}, *Deut.* 9^{28}.

families of the earth,' and draws the terrible and unlooked-for inference, '*therefore* I will visit upon you all your iniquities,' *Amos*, 3^2; so that 'captivity beyond Damascus' awaits the self-confident in their pride, 5^{27}. Hosea interprets the disastrous ruin of his married life as a symbol of Israel's faithlessness to her exalted spouse. Through his own poignant sorrow he comprehends Yahweh's yearning over his people. In the stages of fall and discipline, of recovery and forgiveness, he sees the assurance of a divine love which can never rest until redemption is complete. A new betrothal shall take place, between the nation and its Lord. The earth shall respond to the wedding gifts of corn and wine and oil, and sky shall answer the appeal of earth, and Yahweh himself shall respond to the skies; in righteousness and judgment, in loving-kindness and in mercies, the union of people and God shall be for ever; and the book closes with a vision of Israel like a forest tree quickened into might and beauty with new life.

Here, then, are the beginnings of the great ideas which the people of Yahweh were to carry forth to the world. They are declared in figure and vision, not in terms of abstract thought; they are uttered in the language of poetry instead of philosophy; they are sometimes entangled in the swift movement of events; but the majestic conceptions of Yahweh's creative might, his universal sovereignty, his rule of righteousness, his providential purpose, his inevitable judgment, his purifying love, illumine

these pages with unfading glow. The great critic and historian Kuenen summed up the contribution of eighth century prophecy to the faith of Israel in two words, 'Ethical Monotheism.' How far that description can be said to be exhaustive, we may presently enquire.

VI.

The reaction of prophetic thought on the national traditions has been already indicated. Again and again, it would seem, did later hands, in enthusiastic devotion to the sublime authority of Yahweh, enrich the ancient story with touches prompted by the rising conceptions of his majesty. After Yahweh and his two angels have shared Abraham's hospitality, and Yahweh, questioning within himself whether he should disclose to the patriarch the purpose of his intended visit of inspection to Sodom and Gomorrah, *Gen.* $18^{17\text{-}21}$, follows the solemn interview when Abraham intercedes for the doomed city,—'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?' The plea is inconsistent with the older and ruder representation, and belongs to the wider view which is escaping from its earlier limitations. So does the description of the passing of Yahweh before Moses on the mount, *Exod.* $34^{6\text{-}7}$, with its enumeration of the divine attributes, cited again in *Num.* $14^{17\text{-}18}$.[1] Most striking among such

[1] On other passages in the struggle between Moses and Pharaoh, see *The Hexateuch*, ii., *Ex.* 8^{10} *note*; or *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, 198^{n}.

additions, in the belief of a large company of modern critics, is the brief group of the 'Ten Words' in *Exod.* 20. Unlike other divine instructions to Moses, these are represented as having been actually uttered by Deity from the sacred mount. In this summary of religious and moral duty, 'ethical monotheism' receives its most condensed expression.[1] It was certainly thrown into its present shape (apart from certain details) before the compilation of the Deuteronomic homilies; and it is probably to be regarded as the outcome, in the form of law, of the prophetic conception of the demands of Yahweh on the personal devotion and social life of Israel.[2] In thus concentrating attention on fundamental obligations of pious worship and family sanctity, without reference to ritual observance (save in the keeping of the sabbath), the Decalogue is true to the spirit of the higher prophecy, and rises above the earlier 'Words' of the older document **J** in *Exod.* $34^{10\text{-}27}$.

That the order of history now places 'the Prophets' before 'the Law,' was shown in the last lecture. The full meaning of this inversion of the traditional formula only now, however, comes into view. For it was prophecy which gave to Israel's religion the strength needful to endure the tremendous catastrophes which befel it; and it did

[1] See *The Hexateuch*, ii, on *Exod.* 20; or *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, pp. 223-6. Cp. the article 'Decalogue,' by the Rev. W. E. Addis, in *Encycl. Bibl.*

[2] Compare the precepts ascribed to Triptolemus, a mythical king of Eleusis before the Athenian state was established, who was taught the famous rites by Demeter, 'worship the gods,' 'honour your parents,' and 'hurt not animals.'

this by translating its ideal aims into a definite code of individual and national duty. In the Northern Kingdom its work was not sufficiently developed to attain such an issue. After a siege of three years, Samaria fell in 722 B.C.; and a large portion of its people were deported. Their religion could not endure the shock; it declined and died. Had the conqueror advanced, as some dreaded, against Jerusalem, had Judah met with a like fate, Isaiah would have left no more trace than Amos or Hosea among the Ten Tribes. Four or five generations later it was the turn of the mountain sanctuary. In 586 the Chaldeans did to the city of David what Assyria had done to the city of Omri, 'the proud crown of the drunkards of Ephraim.' But though the Temple perished, prophetism was mighty enough to save Israel's faith out of the wreck, and enrich it with new and still more elevated ideals. What means did it employ for this purpose?

The answer to this question has been already given.[1] The triumph of foreign idolatries under Manasseh was short-lived; the disciples of Isaiah cheerfully laid down their lives for their faith, and the blood of martyrs proved, as usual, the seed of the Church. At length the Book of Deuteronomy embodied the prophetic ideal of a purified worship; and the reforms carried out by Josiah were the first step towards planting the higher religion—'What doth Yahweh thy God require of thee, but to fear Yahweh thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to

[1] See Lect. III. § vi.

love him, and to serve Yahweh thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul?'—deep in the bosom of the people. The reforms of Josiah were, indeed, undone. But no one could undo the publication of Deuteronomy. There stood the great code, bearing on its face the sublime declaration, 'Yahweh our God, Yahweh is one.' What power lay in this combination of the divine Unity with the nationality of the little people of Judah, depended largely on the character of Yahweh. And the conception of his character it was the work of Prophecy continually to exalt.

A glance at some parallel incidents in Greece may bring this process into clearer light. The Greek peoples, spread over a much wider area than the little tribes of Israel, all the way from the Ionian coasts of Asia Minor to South Italy and Sicily, never achieved the same sense of national unity. In the seventh century, before our era, this note was, indeed, already sounded. 'The Panhellenic idea,' says Prof. Bury,[1] 'the conception of a common Hellenic race, with common interests, was displayed above all in the reconstruction of the history of the past. The Trojan war had come to be regarded as a common enterprise of all the Greeks; and this was the idea which inspired the composer of the Homeric catalogue of the Ships, a work of the seventh century. This poet was studious that nearly all the states of Greece should be represented at Troy; and, as the Catalogue

[1] *History of Greece* (1902), i. p. 169.

became part of the *Iliad* in its final shape, the fiction won universal acceptance.' But this growing sense of nationality did not express itself in any corresponding demand for common worship. No single sanctuary, not even that at Delphi, ever attained a supreme place in Greek religion. Philosophically, Zeus might serve as the type of solitary godhead when monotheistic thought rose above the popular polytheism. But this never acquired sufficient force to demand a remodelling of the cultus. Nor could any priesthood elaborate a permanent body of theological teaching which could control the constant tendency of the cults to split up into fresh ones. The great Orphic movement of the sixth century profoundly influenced Greek faith. But it did not exert any unifying influence on the common worships. The principle of centralisation never became a motto for religious reform. In Athens, at a later day, there were nineteen different Zeus-cults, seventeen dedicated to Athena, fifteen to Apollo.[1] With what eyes would Jeremiah have looked on such a sight!

The early religion of Greece, however, was extraordinarily rich in the terminology of prophecy. It has been already noted that the word 'prophet' is of Greek origin; it does not occur in Homer, who uses the term *hypophêtês* instead. When we look coldly on the reformer's 'enthusiasm,' we forget that this term described the inspired condition of the seer into whom the god had physically

[1] De la Saussaye, *Religions-geschichte* (1887), ii. p. 82.

entered.[1] By Apollo's gift Calchas had guided the Greek fleet to the shore of Ilium, and he knew alike past, present, and future. Teiresias, who had been blinded by excess of vision, is designated by Pindar 'chosen prophet of the most high Zeus.' Cassandra feels the burning fire come come upon her, and she must utter her oracles of doom.[2] Under the names of Musæus and Bakis collections of prophecies were made in the sixth century, some of which played a great part in the Persian war.[3] The prophet, then, stood in the inner circle of the divine counsels, and his aid might avail where the priest could do no more. Of this the whole vast system of the oracles is in truth the witness; but, besides these, single figures stand out here and there in interesting relief. Such was the Cretan Epimenides, prophet of Zeus, to whom a late tradition attributed the line cited in *Tit.* 1^{2}, 'Cretans are alway liars.' His story is linked to the events which followed the conspiracy of Cylon.[4]

[1] This conception is philosophically handled by Plato in the *Ion*, pp. 533-4. The Hebrew idiom was that the spirit of Yahweh 'put on' or 'clothed itself with' the human form as a temporary vesture, *Judg.* 6^{34}, 1 *Chron.* 12^{18}, 2 *Chron.* 24^{20}.

[2] Aesch. *Agam.* 1256, cp *Jeremiah*, 20^{9}.

[3] Thus *Herod.* viii. 96, apropos of the battle of Salamis. A curious story is told by Herodotus, vii. 6, concerning a distinguished Orphic teacher, Onomacritos, who was detected in foisting into the writings of Musæus a prophecy that the islands off Lemnos would one day disappear in the sea. For this offence he was banished from Athens by Hipparchus (527-514 B.C.), son of the tyrant Pisistratus.

[4] Grote, Part II, chap. x., follows the older view. Meyer, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, ii. p. 749, denies his historical character, and supposes him to have been developed out of an Attic hero. Bury, *Hist. of Greece*, i. 189, ii.

About 632 B.C. (according to the latest chronology) a certain Athenian noble, named Cylon, attempted to make himself master of Athens. The attempt failed; some of his supporters took refuge in the temple of Athena, Protectress of the city; they were induced to quit the sanctuary on condition that their lives should be spared; but the promise was broken, and they were afterwards executed. The Alcmæonids who were concerned in the violation of the pledge, were banished. But the city still lay under pollution incurred through the insult to the goddess; strange appearances begot popular terror; the Delphic oracle commanded further purification; and the Athenians sent a ship to Crete to invite the aid of Epimenides. He consented, and returned with the escort.[1] But the prophet of Zeus was not concerned to emphasize the sole deity of his Lord, nor even to demand his sole worship. He simply (so ran the tale preserved by Diogenes Laertius) turned out some black and white sheep on the Areopagus; gave orders that their movements should be followed; and where they lay down, he bade the people rear new altars to the local deities. Plutarch does, indeed, ascribe to him further activity. The legislation of Dracon, contemporary with the

475, does not definitely decide. Mr. Frazer, *Pausanias*, vol. ii. p. 123, accepts him as real. For the illustration of ideas, the legends have the same value as facts. See the sketch in the *Lives of the Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius, and in Plutarch's Life of Solon. Plato, however, *Laws*, p. 642, incidentally puts him much later, stating that his visit to Athens took place about ten years before the Persian war, *i.e.* about 500 B.C., when he correctly prophesied the defeat of the invaders.

[1] Mr. Frazer dates his visit about 600 B.C.

Deuteronomic code in 621 B.C., proved inadequate to redress the social wrongs which for more than a generation awoke incessant unrest in Attica. Thirty years later Solon was summoned to the task. Noble and merchant, traveller, sage, he was elected archon,[1] and with a statesmanship of the highest order laid the foundations of Athenian democracy. The way was prepared for him, in Plutarch's view, by his friendship with Epimenides, who privately rendered him considerable help, for Epimenides had induced the Athenians to be more moderate in their mourning, and abandon certain ancient customs (especially among the women) of self-mutilation for the dead.[2] The details of Solon's scheme belong to the history of government. He, too, like the Deuteronomic legislators had to provide a measure of 'release' or 'discharge' for debtors;[3] and enfranchised those who had been enslaved for debt.[4] He, too, dealt with the judicial system; but there was a vast difference between Solon's constitution of the courts on a popular basis, and the theocratic conception of Deuteronomy which entrusted the

[1] In 594-3, or 592-1 B.C., Bury, *Hist.* i. 192; in any case, a few years before the fall of Jerusalem.

[2] Compare *Deut.* 14^{1-2}. Plutarch adds, 'And what was still of greater consequence, by expiations, lustrations, and the erecting of temples and shrines, he hallowed and purified the city, and made people more observant of justice and more inclined to union.'

[3] Comp. *Deut.* 15^{1-11}.

[4] Comp. *Deut.* 15^{12-18}. The *Seisachtheia* by which the oppressed debtors 'shook off their burdens' was the first act of Solon's social reform, and the deliverance was celebrated by a public feast. Compare the covenant under Zedekiah during the Chaldean invasion, *Jer.* 34^{8-22}.

decision of appeals to 'the priest that standeth to minister before Yahweh thy God' 'in the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose.' Solon, also, according to Plutarch, placed his whole legislation under divine protection. Poet as well as law-giver, he threw his laws into verse, and thus invoked the sanction of heaven:

> 'First let us pray to King Zeus, Kronos' son,
> To bless these laws with welfare and renown.'

But the political development in which Solon holds so remarkable place had no adequate connexion with religion to make it in any way a factor of faith. Its interest now is solely antiquarian. There is nothing in it that lives; while the sublime command of Deuteronomy, 'Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength,' still stands, expanded beyond all national limitation, as the fundamental law of religion.

This law, formulated by the prophetic spirit in connexion with the reform of the national worship, really prepared the way for the ultimate severance of religion from the temple-cultus. A relation of affection, a spiritual service of thanksgiving and obedience, could be limited to no place. It could be practised anywhere, and its outward form was independent of ritual or locality. It was the glory of Jeremiah to realise this truth, and by proclaiming the 'new covenant' to become the direct forerunner of the conceptions of Jesus, just as Hosea had anticipated his teaching of God's purpose of re-

deeming love. The death of Josiah on the field of Megiddo was the signal for the revival of the old idolatries. The reappearance of the ancient symbols of the various worships practised along with the national religion, proved how unready the people still were for the higher faith. The dreadful conviction was forced on Jeremiah that there was but one way for their discipline. On its own soil the true religion could not be liberated from the heathen elements which clung to it. Then, it must be uprooted from the soil. Jerusalem must fall; and the nation must bear in exile the sternness of the divine chastisement upon its sin.

For more than twenty years Jeremiah proclaimed this message to an indifferent or hostile people. Of the inward anguish which it cost him, his writings bear ample trace. As the Chaldean power drew nearer and nearer, he pointed to it in the plainest language as the instrument of Yahweh's doom. So high is his sense of Yahweh's universal might, so clear his vision of the necessity of Yahweh's judgment, that he does not hesitate to describe him as employing the King of Babylon as the 'servant' who executes his designs.[1] When the popular party—with their own prophets—protested that the city was safe, for it held Yahweh's house, inviolable upon its sacred mount, Jeremiah replied that he needed no house, and asked why he should not do at Jerusalem what he had done at Shiloh?[2] Yet at the same time he soars to the boldest hopes. The Deuteronomists

[1] *Jer.* 27[6]. [2] *Jer.* 7[1-15], 26[1-9].

had represented Israel as bound to Yahweh by obedience and love. In other words, the true seat of religion lay in the conscience and the affections. The national faith, then, might be detached from its local root, and planted anew in Israel's soul. That change was further aided by the deepening sense of sin, which thrills through the pages of Jeremiah, not only as national guilt, but as personal. From these two elements rose a new view of religion, which regarded it as an inner act of knowledge[1] and reverence in which all could share. And this took shape in Jeremiah's mind, on the analogy of ancient tradition, as a new covenant, not to be realised in tables of stone or in the outer events of history but in the inner life of the heart, when Yahweh should write his teaching *there*, and all should know him from the greatest to the least, *Jer.* $31^{31\text{-}34}$. This was the prophetic ideal. By what steps could Israel be prepared for its fulfilment?

Jerusalem fell, and the catastrophe was the vindication of Jeremiah. Still more than that, it was the justification of Yahweh. Unlike any other national deity, he was exalted in the abasement of his people; for his righteousness was exhibited to the world in the doom which fell on their offences. And for Israel this was, as Jeremiah foresaw, the beginning of new life. Torn from its territorial base,

[1] 'Knowledge of Yahweh' was not merely (or even primarily) intellectual; it was also moral, and really involved the whole field of actual religious experience. In earlier prophecy, as in *Hosea* 4, this meant a 'practical knowledge of the laws and principles of His government in Israel.' See Prof. W. R. Smith, *The Religion of the Semites* (1889), p. 24.

deprived of its external expression in the cultus, religion acquired a fresh meaning. The deep inward experience of Jeremiah had translated it from a national into a personal relation. Yet the sense of membership in a historic community could not be dispersed even by exile; and there arose in the prophetic vision the wonderful figure of the 'Servant of Yahweh,' in which the genius of Israel, as it has been designated, personalised and transfigured, was pictured as Yahweh's chosen messenger to the world, the missionary people who carried forth religion to the nations. On this side of its high task prophecy, in the persons of Jeremiah and the great unknown preacher of the captivity, becomes the herald of the Gospel.

But in another aspect the justification of Yahweh was still incomplete. After all, regard for his great name, the honour of his own deity, demanded that his purpose should not be frustrated by Israel's chastisement. If Israel was not worthy to be the object of Yahweh's favour and the interpreter or exponent of his will, it must be made so. The theodicy of Ezekiel, accordingly, announces the cleansing gift of the spirit, under whose influence a regenerated people will be prepared for a great divine act of restoration (*Ezek.* 36-37). The heart of stone will be changed to a heart of flesh, and the nation, purified and united, shall occupy once more its ancient land. It is plain from Ezekiel's writings how prominent a place this occupied in his own hopes. With the revival of

the national life, religion also would revive. But religion had never existed without some form of public cultus. The return of Israel, therefore, would be the signal for the rise of a new temple on the sacred mount. That it might be protected from all intrusion of idolatry, not only must the 'law of the house' be strictly defined, the ritual of worship must be prescribed, and the duties and privileges of its ministers must be carefully ordained. Israel, in fact, must be guarded against every possibility of temptation. The Deuteronomic reforms had proved inadequate for this end. A more specific code, accordingly, must be devised. Even the regeneration might fail unless the true religion were made absolutely secure. So Ezekiel draws the picture (40-48) of the holy hill in the midst of the holy territory of the priests; the holy house stands on the holy hill; and holy men are chosen for the service of the house. If on one side of his thought he stands in the succession of Jeremiah and the prophet of the Captivity, anticipating the religion of the Spirit, on the other he is the father of Judaism and the forerunner of the religion of the Law.

The form in which actual legislative expression was given to this scheme, has been already described.[1] The great Priestly Code, adopted at Jerusalem under Ezra and Nehemiah, embodied the principles and aims of priestly prophecy as they had been set forth by Ezekiel and his successors.[2]

[1] See Lect. III, pp. 136 ff., 150 ff.

[2] Such as the codifier of the Laws of Holiness in *Lev.* 17-26.

The effort of centuries was at last successful, and produced a community animated by one faith and obedient to one rule. No more was the prophet needed to rebuke or threaten, to plead or to promise. He may yet be heard as the interpreter of some great world-catastrophe (as in *Is.* 24-27); but religious utterance has taken new shape. Instead of a single voice pleading with a rebellious people, rises a chorus of devotion and praise from a whole congregation of the righteous. 'The fundamental religious conceptions are identical,'[1] but while the prophet presents them in the guise of expostulation or appeal, on the lips of the Psalmists they are the accepted and animating principles of life. 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?' cries Isaiah in the name of Yahweh; 'I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts.' And generations after, the Psalmist answers in the name of the people, 'Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.' 'Come now, and let us reason together,' pleads the prophet on behalf of Yahweh; 'though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red as crimson, they shall be as wool.' And the conscience-stricken nation replies in the language of perpetual

[1] See the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, 'The Literature of Israel,' *Modern Review*, vol. iv. (1883), p. 15, where the following and other examples will be found.

aspiration, 'Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.' 'Though they dig down into Sheol, thence shall mine hand take them,' threatens Amos, announcing the intent of Yahweh; 'and though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down.' To the believing people these are the symbols, not of doom, but of happy trust, 'If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there.' So has prophecy accomplished its great end; it has shaped and inspired Israel's faith, and 'ethical monotheism' is established.

VII.

Was there, however, nothing more? Many of the great nations of antiquity attained conceptions of unity in diversity, or elevated one deity into supreme sovereignty over the world alike of gods and men. Before the days of Moses the poet sang of Amon Ra beside the gleaming Nile, as 'the ancient of heaven, the oldest of the earth,' 'Lord of eternity, Maker everlasting,' 'deliverer of the timid man from the violent, judging the poor, the poor and the oppressed,' 'the One Alone with many hands, lying awake while all men sleep, to seek out the good of his creatures.'[1] Pindar, flower of Greek sacred song, can declare that 'God achieveth all ends whereon he thinketh—God who overtaketh even the

[1] *Records of the Past*, ii. pp. 129-33.

winged eagle, and outstrippeth the dolphin of the sea, and bringeth low many a man in his pride, while to others he giveth glory incorruptible.'[1] The Orphic poets sang, 'Zeus is the first, and Zeus shall be the last. . . . . All things are framed of Zeus.' Before Sophocles rose the vision of the eternal ordinances:

> 'Not now or yesterday they have their being,
> But everlastingly; and none can tell
> The hour that saw their birth.'[2]

Empedocles recognises their universality: 'It cannot be that one and the same thing is lawful in one city, and forbidden to others; but universal law stretches throughout the widely ruling sky and the immeasurable beam of light.'[3] And Plato (in the name of 'old tradition') declares that 'God, holding in his hand the beginning, middle, and end of all that is, travels according to his nature in a straight line towards the accomplishment of his end. Justice always accompanies him, and is the punisher of those who fall short of the divine law. . . . . Now God ought to be to us the measure of all things, and he who would be dear to God, must, as far as is possible, be like him, and such as he is.'[4] The early sages of China had worked out the idea of social order as the reflexion of the order of the living Sky, so that the relations of human duty were supported

[1] *Pyth.*, ii. 49-52, transl. by Ernest Myers.
[2] *Antigone*, 456-7 (tr. Campbell).
[3] Quoted by Campbell, *Religion in Greek Literature*, p. 319.
[4] *Laws*, iv. p. 716; Jowett, vol. iv. p. 99 (condensed).

by the cosmic action of an all embracing and beneficient Heaven; and the exhortations to rulers preserved in the Shu King[1] present perhaps the nearest analogies in their conceptions of Providence to the ideas that underly the books of Deuteronomy, Judges, and Kings. The nascent speculation of India, even in the Vedic age, played round the great theme of 'the One with many names.' To the Brahmanism of 500 B.C., when Gotama the Buddha went to and fro in the valley of the Ganges, the great Brahmā was 'the Supreme, the Mighty, the All-seeing, the Lord, the Creator, Father of all that are and are to be, steadfast, immutable, eternal.'[2] Long ere that day Indian thought had worked out the solemn conception that the whole universe, from the topmost heaven to the lowest hell, was under the sovereignty of Justice, whereby each sentient being always and everywhere received precisely what he deserved. But though many ancient religions recognised more or less completely the idea of a divine *rule* of righteousness, it was rarely, save in one conspicuous instance outside Israel, sufficiently strong to beget the further idea of a divine *purpose*. To Zarathustra, indeed, the victory of the good was a necessary postulate of faith. The doctrine of the last things, presented in the Zend Avesta, approaches the nearest to the spirit of Hebrew prophecy; the final destruction of the evil power of the Lie, the renewal of earth and heaven, the re-

[1] Legge, *Chinese Classics*, vol. iii.

[2] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, tr. Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, vol. i. p. 32.

covery of hell for the enlargement of the world, and the union of the faithful in a beatified life of righteousness and worship—these constitute a picture not unworthy to be set beside the visions of the Ideal Future which are chief among the gifts of Israel to humanity.

The higher prophetic faith, and its sequel in the Psalms, were confronted with a still wider question. It dealt with religion pre-eminently as the shaping and controlling power of life. It was not metaphysical, engaged with the great ontological problems of God and the world. Nor was it psychological, occupied with the phases of personal experience, or ethically concerned in the examination of the contents and operation of the conscience. Its field was action; it sought to interpret the vicissitudes of events; it read the meaning in the shifting scenes of Israel's triumph or Israel's pain. At first, as we have seen, the seer's view was limited to the fortunes of his nation. But as Yahweh rose into the majestic grandeur of the Lord of the world, king of the forces of earth and heaven, the scene of his energy expanded, and the prophet saw the scope of his working correspondingly enlarged. For one power conceived one purpose, and made for one goal. A new sense of the unity of history rose dimly in Israel's mind; the past was no hap-hazard succession of incidents, it was bound together by a continuous thread of moral causation; all its changes were seen continually marching to one end, the establishment of the reign of God over man, as his sovereignty was

already acknowledged by nature. Israel thus became the depository of a great trust for the world's welfare; and to this conception of a divine idea destined to be worked out by the nation for the good of man, the prophetic spirit dedicated itself with enthusiastic devotion. As Vergil, reflecting on the majesty of Rome, told the tale of the pious Æneas and his flight from Troy, linking the far-off anguish of the burning city in one chain of Providential design to the full splendours of Augustan glory, so Hebrew prophecy, with a more impassioned sense of the 'tears of things,' a more splendid conviction of the divine righteousness, saw the migration of Abraham's clan, the conflicts of tribes, the rise and fall of dynasties, the clash of empires, all pointing to one end,—the union of the nations in one vast fellowship of obedience and trust.

This great hope was really begotten historically. It finds its earliest expression in the belief that Israel has been chosen for a peculiar destiny. This was, in fact, its own way of explaining the circumstances of its position. The tribes which quitted the Arabian desert, crossed the Jordan under the banner of Yahweh. They took possession of what Yahweh their God could win for them, just as Ammon must be content with whatever Chemosh its god could secure.[1] Their wars were Yahweh's wars; their conquests were Yahweh's victories; their territory was Yahweh's gift. David's empire, so swift in its rise and its decline, is readily brought into the same

[1] See *ante*, p. 189.

scheme. The national traditions, the ancestral story, are all organised on this fundamental idea; and the entire sequence from Abraham onwards is pervaded with like faith. Israel's election is thus the theological method of expressing a particular set of historic facts, the possession of the land of Canaan by a group of allied tribes; it describes the inner meaning of the process by which they acquired it. This doctrine is then inserted into a general view of human history; and Abraham is finally connected with the first father of the race. But though one creative power wrought the world, and one providential purpose guided the steps of man, early thought really concentrated this power and this purpose on the welfare of Israel. It was the work of the higher prophecy of the eighth century to break down this limitation. Two penetrating ideas helped this process. The rule of Yahweh over Israel was asserted to be intrinsically moral; it sought not for national glory but for national righteousness; nor did it shrink from using a foreign power as the means of chastisement for this great end. And, secondly, the sovereignty of the heavenly King was not, after all, confined to Israel. If he brought their tribes to Canaan, he led no less the migration of the Philistines from Caphtor, or the Syrians from Kîr.[1] The movements of nations were all under his control, and the events in the great drama of history were divinely planned. Had Hellenic thought been impregnated with kindred faith, what might not

[1] *Amos* 9[7].

Delphi have discerned in the great conflict between Persia and Greece, what secrets of destiny might not have been won from Marathon and Salamis!

Nothing in truth can exceed the boldness of the seers of Israel. This little mountain people, so insignificant compared with the vast empires of Assyria or Egypt, conceived the idea that it was Yahweh's son. The travail of creation and humanity all happened for its sake. In so august a relation the first question that rose in the prophet's mind concerned the fitting conduct through which Israel should express its obedience. A pure worship and a life of pious duty summed up the demand. On Israel's unfaithfulness judgment must inevitably descend. But behind the dark shadow of impending doom there is always a light of divine purpose. Critical opinion is not now unanimous as to the authenticity of all the passages in which Isaiah, for example, expresses this great faith.[1] But enough remains to shew that whether in the form of a righteous remnant, or a regenerated people, eighth century prophecy discerned the fulfilment of Yahweh's intent for the nation. As the generations follow one another, the mighty hope rises and falls; and it changes its outward expression, for it is always conceived in relation to the circumstances of the time. Sometimes the Davidic king stands with heroic personality in the centre; sometimes he fades into the background or even disappears altogether; but the horizon is always more or less clearly bounded

[1] For instance, *Is.* 9^{1-7}, 11^{1-9}.

by the political powers within the prophet's ken. To this trust a certain passionate strength was given by the doctrine of the inviolability of Jerusalem established with such signal success by Isaiah. The temple on the sacred hill was the earthly counterpart of an ideal sanctuary in heaven where seraphs sang the adoring song 'Holy, holy, holy.' Yet Jeremiah was not afraid to declare its impending fall, as Micah had done before him (comp. *Jer.* 26^{28}), though in the golden future that rises into vision in the distance Jerusalem is once more the centre to which all nations shall be gathered in homage to the heavenly King.[1] This glowing expectation wins splendid utterance in the great ode in *Is.* 60. Jerusalem, lying prostrate on the ground in gloom and desolation, beholds the dawn of a new day of glory, and responds to the mysterious summons 'Arise! Shine!' The gifts of nature and the wealth of nations are lavished on the new sanctuary. What agency has made Zion the religious centre of the world? It is the splendid issue of the work of Yahweh's servant, who takes up the word, 61^{1}, 'The spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me.' His mission is at last fulfilled. It has been his high task to carry forth the truths of Yahweh's religion to the nations. Despised and forsaken, called even to lay down his life, he nevertheless sees of the travail of his soul and makes many righteous. Israel, that is to say,

[1] Whether any portion of $3^{16\text{-}18}$ belongs to Jeremiah himself, is difficult to decide. But 4^{2} and 16^{19} contain the germs of similar hope, though they, also, are not unsuspected.

as the divinely gifted teacher, has a purpose for others as well as for itself. Its destiny is not complete when its own eyes are opened and its own ears unstopped. It is the chosen instrument for the religious education of the world. What other people of antiquity conceived so daring a thought? As we see the essence of the prophetic spirit carried into Europe from Jesus through Paul, shall we not also say that this thought was justified?

The expansion of Israel's hope during the Captivity was doomed to encounter a rude shock after the rebuilding of the temple. But it is never wholly repressed, and again and again it breaks forth anew. The older motives of prophecy concerning Yahweh's demands on Israel's conduct die away, for it has become a 'righteous nation'; but attention is more and more concentrated on the relation of Israel to the Gentiles. Ezekiel depicts a colossal invasion of the mountain land, led by Gôg of Magôg at the head of the peoples of the north, the issue of which is a defeat so crushing that it takes seven months to bury the dead.[1] Along this line prediction busies itself with savage anticipations of the overthrow of opposing powers, such as the blood-bath of Edom, *Is.* 63^{1-6}. All the long pent-up ferocity generated by centuries of suffering is poured into these visions of triumph, when the judgment, once to be pronounced on guilty Israel, is executed, instead, on an unbelieving world. But these are not the only contents of the great picture-gallery of later prophecy.

[1] *Ezek.* 39^{12-15}.

Beside the lurid glow of vindictive passion is the smiling serenity of peace. The unity of Yahweh's purpose will only be completed by the diffusion of the true religion. The correlative result is universal worship. The mountain of the sacred house will rise into a lofty eminence, and draw to itself a perpetual procession of peoples.[1] Old enmities will be done away. Suspicion and mistrust will vanish like the morning mists. The call to prayer sounds in the later Psalms across the earth; the reign of the heavenly king extends over the nations, and their sovereigns become the people of Abraham's God.[2] Far above practical politics, the later prophecy soars into an ideal region of religious union gathering the powers into one fellowship of faith. With Egypt and Assyria, the Gentile despotisms so long contending for the suzerainty of the known world, the little Israel which often bore the brunt of their attacks, shall make a third, 'a blessing in the midst of the earth: for that Yahweh of hosts hath blessed them saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance.'[3] For such a victory of truth and love prophecy might well invoke a new heaven and a new earth as the fitting scene.

The study of the general history of religion only lifts this great conception into clearer view. Its grandeur is heightened by the political insignificance

[1] *Is.* 2^{2-4} and *Mic.* 4^{1-3}. [2] *Ps.* 47^{5-9}.

[3] The date of *Is.* 19^{24-25} is uncertain. It is now placed with much probability early in the Greek age.

of the people which gave it birth. It is wholly misjudged when it is ascribed to the inflated egoism of a nation whose dreams of empire had miscarried. It is the product of a teleological interpretation of history, and its worth for religion is beyond price. The world that we know is wider than that within the prophets' ken. Its peoples are vastly more numerous, their relations are infinitely more complex. In the mighty process of the education of the race, we are more conscious of the difficulties besetting the progress of religion among peoples in every stage of social intellectual and moral advance. Sharp lines are drawn between the higher and the lower culture; and we do not feel the same confidence that any single form of faith can ever embrace them all. Yet the ideals of Hebrew prophecy, set free from local limitation by Jesus, its 'consummate flower,' have been carried round the earth by the most progressive nations. With infinite difficulty the prayer first uttered by Jewish lips, 'Thy kingdom come,' is slowly establishing itself in the human heart. It is the symbol of the triumph of righteousness, the victory of good. In this is expressed what we believe to be the divine purpose for man. This gives a meaning to existence; whoso embraces this as its secret, will never doubt whether life is worth living. It strikes a note of harmony with some of the forecasts of science; and it finds analogies with the unity of thought implied in current ideas of social evolution. In the immense conflict which envelopes us, we can only play our

part worthily when we see however dimly the goal to which it tends. The modern seer truly interprets the spirit of the past when he proclaims as the great object of the faith of the present—

> That God, which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves.

LECTURE V.

THE GOSPELS AND THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

THE books of the New Testament might seem, at first sight, less open to the processes of historical investigation than those of the Old. They are not the remains of an ancient national literature; they are a selection of the teachings of a religious community. Instead of being spread through the greater part of a millennium, they occupy, at the very utmost, only a century.[1] In contents they are far less varied; their range of materials, as of time, is much more limited. But the critic's hand cannot be stayed by such pleas. Nor is he to be debarred by warnings that he is entering the very sanctuary of faith. No sacred plot can be railed off as holy ground, to be reserved from the explorer's eye. The historian claims the right to investigate the whole field of the past, and demands the same freedom in interrogating evangelist or apostle as he has already exercised with law-giver or prophet.

[1] Thus Moffatt, in *The Historical New Testament*, places *1 Thess.* about 51 A.D., and *2 Peter* probably before 150.

Nor does he find his task easier because the records are fewer and briefer, and can all be brought within a hundred years. Their very proximity tends to efface differences; in community of aim and spirit divergences are obscured; and there are no great landmarks of religious history to indicate the course. On the other hand, the problems often present unexpected intricacy where there are the fewest means of solution; and the magnitude of the religious interests which sometimes appear to be involved, adds a fresh danger to error, and lays an added burden of responsibility on teacher and student alike. In attempting to sketch in three brief lectures the principal lines along which Gospel-criticism has advanced, I am very conscious of the difficulties of my task. Much must be omitted, and much more condensed; and the Gospels will be necessarily viewed in an isolation from the general phenomena of the apostolic age which a wider survey might correct. Moreover, the atmosphere of faith and reverence and devotion in which they took shape, can only be realised by long and patient toil; and, in like manner, the modern appreciation of them rests on the interaction of many minds, of many influences, of many modes of thought, which cannot be wholly ignored even in the most hasty recital of the processes by which our present judgments have been reached.

I.

These processes are of necessity largely founded on the comparative study of the Gospels themselves. In the absence of any adequate attestation until a comparatively late date in the second century, the inquirer is thrown back on to the very documents whose origin and history he is endeavouring to trace. So loosely are they constructed, that neither the birth nor death of their subject can be securely assigned to a particular year. But two of them describe his nativity, Matthew and Luke, and their descriptions cannot be reconciled as they stand. The first three are marked by numerous resemblances; they record the same sayings, they report the same parables, they narrate the same incidents —such as the healing of the paralytic let down from the roof, the mission of the Apostles, the feeding of the multitude, the transfiguration, the agony in the Garden. But they are also marked by numerous divergences. Beside the calling of the Twelve Luke places the wider election of the Seventy; he conducts Jesus on his last journey to Jerusalem through Samaria, instead of by the eastern route through Peræa, across the Jordan; and the incidents of the last Supper, the trial and crucifixion, are related by him with startling independence. Moreover, while some representations, such as those of the Baptist's preaching, the Temptation, or the reply of Jesus to the messengers of John, are almost identical in Matthew and Luke, other records, such

as those of the Lord's Prayer, or the Beatitudes, vary widely—not only by condensation or omission, but also in general spirit and individual detail.

The student seeks to explain such facts; and in doing so he also attempts to value them. But for the most part his efforts find little support in known events of external history. Only one great national crisis—the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70—is anywhere in sight; the apostles one by one disappear from the scene, leaving in the majority of cases nothing but the scantiest traces in tradition; and the literature of the age which follows is aggravatingly silent on precisely the points about which we most desire to be informed. The Gospels, then, though they cannot attest themselves, must to a large extent both justify and interpret themselves. Most of the problems which they suggest, can be solved, so far as solution is possible at all, only with their own aid, —by the comparison, that is to say, of the materials which they offer us. The history of Gospel-criticism is in reality a history of this process; and its success depends on the elements selected for judgment, on the skill with which they are displayed before the critical verdict, and the range of considerations admitted to influence the result. In this field, throughout the whole of the last century, the lead remained with Germany.

The English Deists were, however, the first seriously to raise the question of the historic character of the Gospel narratives. The *Discourses on the Miracles* by Thomas Woolston, 'some time

Fellow of Sidney College in Cambridge,' issued in 1727-29, aimed at showing that the stories of the miracles could not be interpreted literally, and must be understood in the allegorical or typical sense of which Origen was the great master.[1] The discussions of the case of the Gadarene demoniac and the withering of the fig-tree under the curse of Jesus, anticipate many of the arguments in the controversy raised by the late Mr. Huxley;[2] and Woolston cites ample justification from Augustine, Hilary, and other eminent Church fathers, for his attempt to give a mystical meaning to inconvenient facts. Had Woolston been acquainted with the conception of the myth, afterwards applied by Strauss (see p. 238 ff.), he would have found a simpler way out of his difficulties. Neither he, however, nor his critics,—and they were numerous—thought of approaching the question from the side of an investigation of the documents. Woolston took the Evangelists for granted, and concerned himself not with the origin but with the meaning of their narratives. These were all assumed by the apologists as the authentic reports of eye-witnesses or their companions. When Paley, in 1794, summed up a century of controversy in his *Evidences of Christianity*, he could boldly affirm (chap. viii.) that 'the authors of all the histories

[1] His first work, in 1705, *The Old Apology for the Truth of the Christian Religion against the Jews and Gentiles Revived*, was based on the typological interpretation of the Mosaic Law, in support of which (p. 30) he cites Origen.

[2] Unhappily, Woolston, who had already suffered from derangement, lowered himself and his subject by almost incredible vulgarities and insinuations.

lived at the time and on the spot'; and though for argument's sake he enquires what would be the result if the Gospels bearing the names of Apostles should be rejected as unauthentic, he decides that 'if any one of the four be genuine, it is sufficient for our purpose.' In Luke, therefore, he finds a 'writer immediately connected with the transaction, with the witnesses of it, with the persons engaged in it'; and such testimony is adequate to sustain the mighty fabric of the traditional faith.[1]

The movement of criticism in Germany started from a somewhat similar impulse, but rapidly left the apologists behind. In 1767 died Hermann Samuel Reimarus, whose duties as Professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages, in his native city of Hamburg, did not prevent him from ranging freely through philology, mathematics, natural science, history, political economy, and philosophy. He edited Dio Cassius, he wrote a manual on logic (which reached a fifth edition), and he published a collection of essays on the principal truths of natural religion. His general point of view resembled that of the English Deists. This was indicated more fully in the work which his daughter Elise placed, after her father's death, in the hands of Lessing, who in 1770

[1] The germs of critical enquiry, however, have been already planted. Writing after Townson (see below, p. 225), Paley observes that the concurrences between Matthew and Luke 'cannot easily be explained otherwise than by supposing that Luke had consulted Matthew's history, or, what appears to me in no wise incredible, that minutes of some of Christ's discourses, as well as brief memoirs of some passages of his life, had been committed to writing at the time; and that such written accounts had by both authors been occasionally admitted into their histories.'

became librarian at Wolfenbüttel in Brunswick. There, some years later (1774-8), under the title of the 'Wolfenbüttel Fragments,' he published passages from it dealing with the Gospel narratives of miracles in the spirit of an acute but narrow rationalism. They excited a fierce resentment, and the controversy which they produced drew from Lessing —not a defence of the conclusions of Reimarus— but a vindication of the right of free discussion of the loftiest subjects in history and religion. It was the beginning of new enquiries into the origins of Christianity and the real nature of its teachings. To these researches Lessing himself contributed a powerful stimulus in an essay which was not, however, published till after his death in 1781,[1] entitled *A New Hypothesis concerning the Evangelists, considered simply as Human Historians*.[2] This was announced as only 'the first lines' of a treatise at which he had been at work for several years. Lessing began by pointing out that in *Acts* 24[5] the early Christians were described as Nazarenes; among them must very early have sprung up some written collection of narratives of Christ's life and teachings, on the basis of the oral recitals of the Apostles and others who had known Jesus. Traces of this Gospel might be discovered down to the age of Jerome at the end of the fourth century, under the name of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Jerome himself valued

[1] In his *Theologischer Nachlass*, 1784.

[2] In Lachmann's edition of Lessing's complete works, 1839, vol. xi. pp. 495-514.

it so highly that he took the trouble to translate it into both Latin and Greek. In this Gospel Lessing found the origin of our *Matthew*; it had been used also by Mark, probably in a less complete form; it had also been employed by Luke who had transferred the greater part of it, though in different order, into his own work. These three Gospels, however, really constituted only one—that of the flesh. If Christianity was not to slumber and disappear among the Jews as a mere Jewish sect, if it was to step forth among the Gentiles as an independent religion, it needed a new presentation. This was achieved by John in the Gospel of the spirit, which gave to Christianity its enduring form, and sent it forth into the world to last for ever. 'I do not think,' wrote Lessing to his brother Karl in February, 1778, 'that I have ever written anything more sound and complete in this line; or, I may add, more ingenious.'[1] The new thought was beginning to lay the foundations of critical and historical enquiry.

In the meantime fresh methods of study were devised. In 1776 Griesbach, who had just become professor at Jena, published a remarkable *Synopsis* of the first three Gospels. It was designed to prove their general identity of view, contrasted with the Fourth Gospel, so that they came in consequence to bear the name *synoptic*. It shewed precisely what materials they had in common, and what was only represented in any two of them. The same method

[1] T. W. Rolleston, *Life of Lessing*, 1889, p. 175.

also revealed their differences, the genius, character, and style of each; and thus at once suggested a literary instead of a dogmatic treatment. Thirteen years later, in 1789, appeared an essay to prove that *Mark* was wholly derived from *Matthew* and *Luke*.[1] Observing that all but about twenty-four verses in the Gospel—including the parable of the husbandman $4^{26\text{-}29}$, and the cure of the blind man at Bethsaida $8^{22\text{-}26}$—were represented in *Matthew* and *Luke*, he argued that *Mark* was little more than an abstract or epitome of these larger works, extending the well-known view of Augustine[2] to include his dependence on the third Gospel as well as the first. Other writers, notably Johann Salomo Semler of Halle, who had already criticised the English Townson, were at work on the same problem, and in a short time three different explanations were more or less distinctly formulated.

The resemblances in the first three Gospels really attracted notice, or at least invited explanation, earlier than the differences. The easiest suggestion was that successive evangelists used their predecessors' work. This was argued, as early as 1778, by the Rev. Thomas Townson,[3] who published at Oxford in that year *Discourses on the four Gospels, chiefly with Regard to the peculiar Design of each, and the*

[1] *Marci Evangelium totum ex Matthaei et Lucae Commentariis decerptum esse monstratur*, Jenae, 1789.

[2] *De Consensu Evangel.* i. 2.

[3] Of Magdalen College, Oxford. He had held various preferments, and in 1783 was offered the regius professorship of divinity in the university, but he declined it on the ground of his age. He was then sixty-eight.

Order and Places in which they were written. His argument was directed against the attempt to account for their similarities by the common use of 'detached pieces,' and led to the conclusion 'that the following evangelists had seen the former Gospels.' A comparison of parallel passages showed that the processes of composition implied the exercise of taste and skill, so that the enquiry into their relations must be conducted on literary rather than dogmatic grounds:

> 'Since, therefore, it appears that the Evangelists were left in ordinary cases to their own judgment in the choice of words, circumstances, and method, we are not concerned to resolve a concurrence in these into the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit' (p. 63).

Matthew, accordingly, was supposed to have written in Judea, within a few years of the Ascension. Mark took Matthew's Gospel to Rome, and there (or at least in Italy) under Peter's direction wrote the second Gospel with the help of the first. Luke, employing the narratives of both Matthew and Mark, composed his gospel with an especial view to converted Gentiles; Mr. Townson shrewdly remarking (p. 192), 'Both Mark and Luke so express themselves as to enlarge the sense of precepts or doctrines which the letter of St. Matthew seems to confine to the house of Israel.' This explanation has been repeatedly applied to determine the relation of Mark to the other two. But it is capable of exactly opposite uses. The authority of Griesbach was long quoted in favour of Mark's literary de-

pendence on Matthew and Luke. The same position in the series was assigned to it on other grounds, as will be shortly shown, by the Tübingen critics. Modern scholars, however, precisely reverse this estimate; Mark is the original, and Matthew and Luke have both worked upon it, though in different ways and varying extent.[1]

A second theory traced the similarities in the Gospels to common antecedent traditions preserved at different centres of early Christian teaching in forms that were still flexible and capable of some amount of reconstruction. This view had the undeniable merit of starting from circumstances which were generally recognised. No one ever alleged that Jesus had committed any of his teaching to writing. Nor was it often supposed (with Paley) that any enthusiastic hearer had made notes of it during his lifetime. After he passed away there was no medium for preserving the remembrance of his words or deeds save the recollection of his disciples. Their first interest was the proof of his Messianic function; and to the establishment of this was their first preaching devoted. Only by degrees did the reminiscence of anecdote and saying gather round the central conception of their Master as the Christ, and these were gradually formed into groups and series of traditions, which were carried by the apostolic missionaries from place to place. The essential material was mainly collected at Jerusalem under

[1] See Lecture VI.

the sanction of the Apostolic College. But as it was propagated, it took up additional items, and though frequent repetition imparted to it a certain coherence of form, on the other hand it naturally led to variations of order and expression. Fragments of such traditions floated indefinitely in the consciousness of the Church; their occasional entry into the written forms of the Gospel may sometimes be traced with the help of textual criticism[1]; in other cases we know them only from later works, like the saying in *Acts* 20^{35}, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'[2]

The first writer to lay stress on facts of this order was J. C. R. Eckermann in the fifth volume of his *Theologische Beiträge*, published at Altona in 1796; the transition to written Gospels did not take place, in his view, till the age of Trajan at the end of the first century of our era. The main exposition of this conception, however, was due to J. K. L. Gieseler, afterwards well known as a historian of the Church. In his first work,[3] while he was still Conrector of the Gymnasium at Minden, he sought to explain the common matter of the Gospels by the propagation of a tradition which, unlike the rigid form of a creed imposed by an ecclesiastical Council,

[1] See the Revisers' Margin on *Luke* 9^{56} $22^{43\text{-}4}$, 23^{34}, *John* 7^{53}—8^{11}; and the anecdote in D following *Luke* 6^{5}.

[2] The most comprehensive collection is to be found in the *Agrapha* of Dr. Resch, 1889; he supposes them, however, to be derived from lost Gospels. He reckons 74 as genuine, and 103 as apocryphal.

[3] *Historisch-Kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1818.

might vary in different circles and under new influences.[1] Matthew preserved many sayings suited only for Jewish Palestinian Christians; in $10^{5\text{-}6}$ or $15^{21\text{-}28}$ the 'particularist' limitation was obvious; Luke on the other hand gave to the Gospel a 'universalist' interpretation; while the Fourth Gospel presupposed the wide diffusion of the narrative cycle practically contained in the Synoptics, and was designed for believers who had received some education in philosophy.[2]

The theory of the origin of the Gospels in tradition has received in modern times the weighty advocacy of Dr. Westcott,[3] who found in it an adequate solution alike of the resemblances and of the variations in the Synoptic records. The oral Gospel was supposed to have been translated into Greek before it was committed to writing; and its two forms, the original in the vernacular Aramaic, and the derived in the language of the Gentile Christians, continued to subsist side by side. When the production of written Gospels began, *Mark* was the first to assume definite literary shape, then *Luke*, and thirdly *Matthew*. In Dr. Westcott's hands the theory seemed somewhat vague; but no one can

[1] When the traditions had been translated into Greek, the first recorders might be compared, Gieseler thought, with the Greek logographers before Herodotus.

[2] In 1837, Prof. Andrews Norton, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, published a treatise on the *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, in which he explained the correspondence of the Synoptists by the prior existence of apostolic traditions, 2nd. ed. London, 1847, vol. i. pp. 284-296.

[3] *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 6th ed. 1881.

charge the able little book of the Rev. A. Wright on *The Composition of the Four Gospels* (1890) with lack of precision. Mr. Wright conceives that an order of catechists was recognised in the early churches, charged with the duty of giving instruction in the traditions by constant oral repetitions. Of these traditions he recognises three series; the first cycle was due to Peter, and is embodied in our *Mark;* the second was collected in Matthew's 'logia of the Lord,' and may be traced in *Matt.* 3-25 after the elimination of the cycle represented by Mark; the third proceeded from a disciple of St. Paul, and survives in the peculiar section *Luke* 9^{51}—18^{14}, when the materials incorporated from the first and second cycles are withdrawn. Mr. Wright places *Mark* soon after 70 A.D.; *Matthew* he regards as composed a few years earlier than *Luke;* and Luke, who had not seen the Marcan Gospel, wrote shortly before 80 A.D. The significance of these dates will be expounded in the next lecture.

Yet a third theory is possible. The very striking resemblances in many passages of the Synoptists early appeared too close to be attributed to so fluctuating an element as tradition. To what, then, could they be ascribed? If they were not due to the actual use of the earlier by the later, or to their mutual dependence on similar groups of oral teaching, they must rest on the employment of common written materials. This was the conception, as we have seen, of Lessing; it had been approached by Johann Salomo Semler in discussing Townson's

theory; but it received its most elaborate justification in Eichhorn's famous essay on the Three First Gospels in 1794.[1] Eichhorn began by dividing their contents into three groups; (1) the passages common in some form to all three; (2) those which recurred in any two; and (3) those peculiar to each. The first group he traced back to the primitive document in its simplest form: and the hypothesis of its circulation in different localities with various additions enabled him to explain the cases where two Gospels seemed to have been using a similar source, and further to account even for the matter belonging only to one. With remarkable courage he addressed himself to the problem of determining the original contents of the antecedent Gospel. They were found, of course, in the passages traceable in the three Synoptists; and he arranged them, from the baptism to the resurrection in forty-two sections. This primitive story he conceived to have been written in the vernacular Aramaic: and he strenuously maintained that none of the evangelists had seen the work of the others.

The main conception of Eichhorn was enthusiastically adopted by Dr. Herbert Marsh, of Cambridge,[2] in his *Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of the First Three Gospels*, 1801,[3] though

[1] Published in his *Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur*, vol. v., Leipzig, 1794. See further, vol. i. of his *Introduction to the N.T.*, 1804.

[2] See *ante*, Lect. I., p. 14.

[3] Appended to his translation of Michaelis' *Introd. to the New Testament*, vol. iii. pt. ii.

he found it needful to make many modifications of detail. After a minute examination of the passages in which all three agreed, or any two, he supposed their ultimate foundation to lie in a common Hebrew original, designated ℵ. The ancient form of Matthew, also in Hebrew, was simply ℵ with additions. Mark and Luke translated ℵ into Greek, each employing a form with elements peculiar to itself; but they also used an independent rendering of ℵ into Greek. Lastly, the Hebrew Matthew was also translated into Greek, with the further aid of the Greek sections of *Mark* and *Luke*. Our *Matthew*, therefore, was the latest of the three. It was easy to deride such a theory as impracticably elaborate;[1] and Marsh's exposition was not always calculated to win assent. But in one form or other it has perpetually tended to reappear. Only ten years have passed since Prof. J. T. Marshall argued with much learning in favour of an original Aramaic Gospel,[2] though his argument hardly survived the criticism of the Rev. Willoughby C. Allen;[3] and with unwearied courage and patience Dr. Edwin A. Abbott developes his

[1] See the article 'Gospels' in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. i., 1863, by Dr. Thomson, then Archbishop of York. Much more sympathetic was the earlier criticism of Daniel Veysie, in *An Examination of Mr. Marsh's Hypothesis respecting the Origin of our Three First Canonical Gospels*, Oxford, 1808; his chief modification was that he broke up the common vernacular original into a number of 'narratives of detached parts of the history of Jesus, some in Hebrew and others in Greek,' after the manner of Paley before him, and Schleiermacher ten years later.

[2] In a series of papers in the *Expositor*, 1891-2.

[3] *Expositor*, vol. vii. 1893.

thesis that ' parts of the Synoptic Gospels are based upon a common original Hebrew document,' Hebrew being used not in the loose sense of the vernacular Aramaic (with Marsh), but in the strict sense, Biblical Hebrew.[1] The work of the end of the eighteenth century is thus continued at the beginning of the twentieth.

The three theories thus briefly sketched are further susceptible of combination in various ways. Herder, for instance, who united the parts of philosopher, theologian, and critic, published an essay in 1797[2] in which he shot a series of penetrating glances into the early history of the Gospels. Their common ground-work he placed in the tradition of the apostolic teaching, which was propagated in the vernacular Aramaic, before it was carried among the Greeks. The best representative of this earliest form is to be found in *Mark*. Twenty years later, in times of persecution and national distress, the Aramaic Gospel of the Hebrews was compiled, to give emphatic expression to the Messianic hope. Our *Mark* was the first Gospel to take shape in Greek; faithful to the primitive sketch, Mark, who was Peter's companion in Rome, followed his original very closely, adding sundry explanations for foreign readers. *Luke* was written for Hellenist Christians by a companion of Paul, who not only knew *Mark*

[1] *Clue*, 1900, p. xvii.; *The Corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke*, 1901.

[2] Entitled 'Regel der Zusammenstimmung unsrer Evangelien, aus ihrer Entstehung und Ordnung,' in his *Christliche Schriften*, vol. iii.

but freely used it together with the Gospel of the Hebrews. Third in the time-series (as in the later order of Westcott) stands our Greek *Matthew*, after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D ; it was in reality a free translation of the Gospel of the Hebrews, some things being omitted, and yet others added. Finally, at the end of the century came *John*, briefly described as 'the echo of the older Gospels in a higher key.'

One other famous name in German theology further calls for notice, that of the great Berlin preacher Schleiermacher. In the astonishing range of subjects covered by his university lectures—ethics, theology (dogmatic and practical), church history, logic and metaphysics,—even pedagogy and politics, —the study of the New Testament was naturally included. His critical essay on the Gospel of Luke (published in English by Thirlwall, 1825) was enriched with an introduction in which he endeavoured to set aside Eichhorn's theory of a primitive Aramaic Gospel in favour of more numerous if scantier documents, founded on oral narratives of incident or discourse. Notes of this kind were made from the apostolic preaching both among Jewish and Greek Christians; they were collected, perhaps even grouped in small series of parables, or miracles, or the scenes of the last days. Some were simple, some composite; and out of those early documents (to which Luke alludes in his preface) came the materials of our Gospels. Of these, as he afterwards showed, *Matthew* was founded on the

Matthæan collection[1] of the 'Logia' of Jesus; it was not, therefore, itself apostolic. That character belonged to *John* alone, and entitled the Fourth Gospel to preference over the Synoptics. Concerning *Mark*, Schleiermacher added his great authority to Griesbach's view that it was a later compilation based on *Matthew* and *Luke*. Not till 1838 was this latter theory seriously challenged; when two scholars Christian Gottlob Wilke and Ch. Hermann Weisse independently reverted to Herder's conviction of Mark's priority. Wilke[2] based his argument partly on tables showing that in their distribution and arrangement *Matthew* and *Luke* could only be explained as diverging from a common type still preserved in *Mark*. He laid emphasis on the evidences of literary plan, proving that they were not mere aggregates of oral traditions; he inferred that *Matthew* and *Luke* depend on *Mark*, or an earlier text which *Mark* has expressed more clearly than the other two, the type common to all three being Greek, and not a translation of a primitive Jerusalem gospel; but he reached the strange conclusion that in the common matter belonging to *Matthew* and *Luke*, *Matthew* was based on *Luke* and had no other source. To Weisse,[3] on the other hand, belongs the credit of approaching nearest to the modern two-

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1832, p. 735, 'Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien.' The 'Logia' were contained in *Matt.* 5-25, especially in such groups as 5-7, 10, 13^{1-52}, 18, 23, 24-25.

[2] *Der Urevangelist*, Dresden and Leipzig, 1838.

[3] *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1838.

document hypothesis, which may now be said to be most widely—though not universally—accepted. *Mark*, he argued from $9^{33\text{-}50}$ and its parallels, is a common source for *Matthew* and *Luke;* while the matter traceable in these two, unrepresented in *Mark,* is drawn from the original Matthæan *Logia*. Thus, a third of the century had passed before the hypothesis was propounded which was to secure the majority of suffrages by its close.

II.

The criticism of the Gospels involves, in fact, two problems, whose close relation was then hardly realised. It has in the first place a literary aim. It seeks to determine the nature and extent of the materials which their authors employed; to account for the forms in which they are combined; to ascertain the mutual relations of the Gospels to each other; to fix, if possible, the order of their production and the main characteristics of their writers. But behind these literary problems lie the historical. What are the actual values of the several narratives for fact? How far are they real records of real events? When they describe the person or the teachings of Jesus in different ways, as may be seen, for example, in the Synoptic pictures on the one hand and the Fourth Gospel on the other, how far is it possible to account for the differences and determine their historic worth? Or where the divergences are still prominent though on a smaller

scale, as between the beatitudes of *Matt.* 5 and the blessings and the woes of *Luke* 6, can the methods of research pass behind them, and settle not only which is earlier and which later, but which more nearly represents the actual thought and speech of Jesus? And yet again, in the case of stories which criticism is compelled to reject as history, while it accepts them as symbols, like the narratives of the virgin birth, the temptation, the transfiguration, the final appearance of Jesus on the Galilean mount charging the disciples to make disciples of all nations, what explanation can be given of their origins, how far can the motives which produced them be discerned, and the processes which shaped them be traced? In instances such as these, the historic and the literary problems are most closely related. The assumptions of the eighteenth century, that the Gospels contained the testimony of eye-witnesses, and must therefore be accepted as accurate reports, were brought into inevitable conflict with the new conceptions of philosophy and science, and the results (as will be seen immediately) were sometimes grotesque and shocking. It was impossible in that age, and under existing conditions, to escape from such treatment as that of Woolston and Reimarus save by rationalistic evasions like those of Paulus. The time was ripe, therefore, for a new movement. The year 1835, already notable in Old Testament study for the publication of the treatises of Vatke and George, was still more distinguished by the

appearance of the Life of Jesus by David Frederick Strauss, and two essays, one on Gnosticism, the other on the Pastoral Epistles, by Ferdinand Christian Baur. These books really led the way in New Testament study for the labours of the famous Tübingen school during the next thirty years.[1]

Baur and Strauss were both of them natives of Würtemberg, and Baur (born in 1792) had been the actual teacher of Strauss, who was sixteen years younger, in an Evangelical seminary at Blaubeuren near Ulm before 1825. In 1826 Baur became professor at the University of Tübingen, where Strauss was already a student; and under the influence of his old master, Strauss made acquaintance with the writings of Schleiermacher. In 1830 he entered the Church and became assistant to a country clergyman; he fulfilled his new duties with zeal, and both as pastor and preacher secured the affections of his parishioners. He had already begun to study Hegel before he left Tübingen, and in 1831 he removed to Berlin to hear the two great philosophic theologians in their own lecture-rooms.[2] His stay was not of long duration. Hegel died of cholera soon after; and in 1832 Strauss went back to Tübingen as junior lecturer in the university. There he devoted himself without delay to the preparation of his Life of Jesus. It was published

[1] Compare Pfleiderer, *Development of Theology in Germany since Kant*, London, 1890, Book III., chap. i.

[2] A description of their rivalry will be found in Fairbairn's *Place of Christ in Modern Theology* (1893), p. 232.

in two parts in 1835-6, and at once excited eager and angry attention. The originality of its conception and the range of its learning were alike remarkable in so young a man; and the design was wrought out with a boldness of execution and a force and charm of style which lifted it at once out of the range of ordinary theological treatises. Baur said of it ten years later that it became the living centre of the whole critical movement of the time. But to understand why it produced such an effect, a word must first be said concerning the method of treating the Gospel narratives against which Strauss flung himself with all his force.

For more than half a century since the publication of the Wolfenbüttel fragments there had been a powerful reaction in German thought against the supernatural elements of the Bible story. The study of classical antiquity had disclosed the existence of legends somewhat resembling those of the Old Testament, and had further shown that with the rise of loftier views of the nature of the Deity fresh methods of interpretation must be devised. What was true of the early exercise of Greek imagination, was confirmed from the newly discovered literature of ancient India. And the argument from history was reinforced from the side of science and philosophy. The idea of the uniformity of nature did not admit of the violation of its laws: and the conception of an immanent reason could not be harmonised with the sudden intrusion of a thaumaturgic energy. But on the other hand, the traditional

view of the Gospels supposed them (or, at least, two of them) to be the work of eye-witnesses whose veracity could not be impeached. The narratives of the supernatural, therefore, must be substantially true, but they must receive some other explanation. To this object Dr. H. E. G. Paulus devoted himself with untiring assiduity. In writings that spread over a whole generation[1] he urged that a careful distinction must be drawn between the actual occurrence and its interpretation. When this was accomplished, he pleaded, the student would find—not without wonder—how much of the common belief in the miraculous rested on nothing more than *inference* from the simple statements of the Evangelists. With immense learning and a surprising fertility of resource, but with a curious lack of imagination, he analysed the successive stories of the biographers of Jesus into the most lamentable commonplace. The Miraculous Conception originated in peculiarities of Jewish phraseology, and as to the angel message it was not needful to ask by whom it was actually delivered. At the Baptism, as Jesus came up out of the water, the clouds parted over his head, and a dove flew down through the opening. Paulus did, indeed, reject the supposition of a contemporary—the anonymous author of *the Natural History of the Prophet of Nazareth*[2]—that the devil of the

[1] His first Commentary on the New Test. was produced in 1800. The method there indicated was carried further in the *Life of Jesus* (1828) and the *Exegetical Handbook to the First Three Gospels*, 1830-32.

[2] *Die natürliche Geschichte des Propheten von Nazareth* (1800).

Temptation was an artful emissary of the Pharisees; but he supposed the Transfiguration to be due to the glow of sunrise on Hermon, where Jesus had made an appointment with two unknown persons,[1] whom the three apostles—awaking out of sleep, and ignorant of the preconcerted rendezvous—mistook for Moses and Elias. The feeding of the five thousand was the effect of example; how could those among the crowd who had brought provisions with them fail to respond to the impulse of Jesus and the demands of oriental hospitality? Even Schleiermacher in his lectures on the Life of Jesus[2] had dwelt on the difficulty of visualising the actual multiplication of the loaves in the hands either of the Teacher or the disciples; and had on more than one occasion come perilously near similar evasions. When Jesus afterwards appeared to be walking on the water, he was really (according to Paulus) pacing a projecting spit of sand: Peter set out to swim to him, but was nearly sucked back by the waves that broke upon the beach. The resurrection was the revivification of the actual body which had hung upon the cross; rigor set in early and produced apparent death, accelerated by the suffocating atmosphere of the earthquake. Leading his disciples on to the Mount of Olives in the early morning hours, he was enveloped by mist upon the summit and

[1] Another writer identified them as Essenes!

[2] Delivered in Berlin in 1832 (Strauss might have heard some of them), but not published till 1864.

disappeared from their sight.[1] Even Eichhorn had admitted this method in the Old Testament; had supposed that Moses kindled a fire on the top of Mount Sinai, the impression being heightened by a timely thunderstorm;[2] and—most grotesquely of all—had explained his shining countenance by the suggestion that he got overheated in his descent! It was less wonderful that inferior scholars should apply similar treatment to the New: that G. L. Bauer should interpret the heavenly glory at the birth of Jesus as a meteoric phenomenon, or resolve the angels at the tomb into white grave-clothes: that Kaiser should expound the conversion of water into wine at Cana as a friendly jest by which Jesus conveyed a handsome gift to the bridal pair: that the view of the kingdoms of the world seen from the mysterious mount of the Temptation should be limited to Palestine and its tetrarchies,—or should

[1] Writing on 'Strauss and Parker' in the *Westminster Review*, for April, 1847, Dr. Martineau observed of Paulus (p. 147): 'The looseness of his scholarship, and the extravagance of his exegetical conjectures, have exposed him to a ridicule against which, assuredly, no just protection can be raised. But the few who, in this country, really know his writings, will forego the defence of him, unpopular though it be, with something of sorrowful reluctance. For he is the most delightful of companions, though not the safest of guides. Rich in moral wisdom, and open to all gentle affections, he discerns as few have done the deep *human* element pervading the history of Christ, and the Spirit of Christianity. As you follow with him the steps of the Nazarene, you may fail, indeed, to observe the halo of preternatural glory; you may miss something of the special costume of the age and clime; but you behold a figure never to be effaced in forgetfulness, never to be remembered without reverence; a figure so gracious, so majestic, so tinctured with the beauty of the holiest humanity, as to make you grateful for the vision; and to wring from you the confession that he who can show you this, if he strays from the sources of theology, does not wholly mistake the fountains of religion.'

[2] Such as Paulus and G. L. Bauer also conjectured on Hermon.

even shrink into a display of their outlines to Jesus by the devil in a map: or that the angels who ministered to him after the conflict should be nothing more than soft and refreshing breezes, or on the other hand substantial as a caravan laden with provisions!

With these degrading travesties Strauss would make no terms. But the method which he employed to overthrow them seemed, for a time at least, to destroy everything. The external testimony was of a most uncertain kind; neither *Matthew* nor *John* could be definitely referred to apostles;[1] at least thirty years must have elapsed between the death of Jesus and the origin of our Gospels; and in that interval there was ample time for unhistorical elements to enter in. What was the nature of these elements? To explain this Strauss resorted to the conception of the Myth.

The students of Greek mythology had long been busy with the records of ancient Hellenic thought, and the poetical representations of the stories of the gods. No one proposed to interpret these as facts;

[1] In the case of the Fourth Gospel he makes the suggestive remark: 'That there were two Johns, the Apostle and the Presbyter, living contemporaneously at Ephesus, is a circumstance which has not received sufficient attention in connexion with the most ancient testimonies in favour of the derivation from John, of the Apocalypse on the one hand, and of the Gospels and Epistles on the other' (Engl. Transl. by George Eliot, 2nd ed. 1892, p. 73). This translation was made from the 4th German edition, 1840. Some vacillation had marked the intervening volumes; in this Strauss returned to the trenchant language of the first.—An earlier translation had appeared in four small volumes, founded apparently on the third edition, and published by Henry Hetherington (London) and Joseph Taylor (Birmingham), 1841 (?) —1844. On English work in a similar direction see below, p. 283.

though they might be investigated from different points of view as the imaginative vesture of ideas. Some writers declared them to contain a kind of primitive science; others regarded them as the early symbols of faith. It was plain, however, that the myth was not concerned only with the supernatural. Its object was to express the thoughts and feelings of the community in which it arose: it was the spontaneous creation of heightened emotion. But this might attach itself to historical persons and incidents as well as to the powers of nature or the dwellers in the upper worlds; and the pages of Herodotus (for example) showed how rapid might be the process of its formation. The myth, therefore, as the pictorial utterance of an idea, did not of necessity involve anything miraculous at all; though this element might readily appear in its final shape. This key had been already applied to the origins of Hebrew faith in the Old Testament. Not only did it remove the opening chapters of Genesis from inevitable conflict with scientific truth, it could be employed to illustrate episodes in the lives of heroes like Moses or Samson. Could it be recognised in the New Testament? And if so, within what limits might it be admitted? The stories of the birth and the ascension of Jesus had already been interpreted upon these lines. As early as 1799 the author of an anonymous work on 'Revelation and Mythology' had argued that the whole life of Christ, what he should be and do, had an ideal existence in the Jewish mind long prior to his

birth.[1] The incidents were all ready, waiting for his appearance, and they crystallised at once around the person of Jesus.

It was with this general conception in his mind that Strauss approached the Gospel narratives. A single example of his method must suffice. The difficulties of contemporary rationalism in dealing with the story of the Temptation, on the twofold assumption that it was an actual historic occurrence and that it contained nothing supernatural, have been already noticed. Modern students have ceased to interpret it literally, to picture Jesus conveyed bodily through the air to the Temple roof, or planted on the summit of an impossible mountain with the earth spread out as a flat plain beneath him. Is the narrative, then, a vision or a dream, induced, perhaps, by the exhaustion of long fast? The vision and the dream are not unknown in the New Testament, but they are always specified as such;[2] and there is no indication elsewhere that Jesus was ever subject to such ecstasies or attached importance to dreams. Is it, then, a parable, perhaps founded on some real experience related by Jesus to his disciples? Schleiermacher, indeed, described it as a parable, but he protested with impassioned earnestness against the supposition that it corresponded to any actual occurrence in the inner life of Jesus.[3] It was not, however, the manner of Jesus to

[1] Quoted by Strauss, Introduction, § ii.

[2] For instance, *Matt.* 1^{20} 2^{13}, *Acts* 9^{12} 10^{10}.

[3] See *ante*, Lect. I. p. 16. With the Christological difficulty we are not

make himself the subject of a parable, any more than any other specific individual, like Peter or John: and if the story was told of him by others, as an attempt to delineate his inner experience at the beginning of his Messianic career, the proper name for such imaginative creation is not parable, but myth.

Out of what impulses, then, did it arise? One of Messiah's functions was to destroy the works of the devil (1 *John* 3^8); and Satan and his demons are leagued against the representative of the sovereignty of heaven. It was Satan who tried Job, and incited David to number the children of Israel (*1 Chron.* 22^1); and it was the expectation of later Jewish theologians that Messiah would be exposed to his assaults. The wilderness was notoriously the haunt of the demonic powers; there, too, had Israel, firstborn son of Yahweh, passed through its

concerned here. It may be sufficient to notice that it has somewhat changed its aspect in view of the frank recognition in modern apologetics of the human element in the person of Christ. Thus in 1863 the Archbishop of York could write (Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, i. p. 1042): 'It was the trial of One Who could not possibly have fallen. This makes a complete conception of the temptation impossible for minds wherein temptation is always associated with the possibility of sin.' Dr. Thomson rejects the theories of vision or ecstasy and parable on the ground that 'all these suppositions set aside the historical testimony of the Gospels.' But he sets this testimony aside himself directly after when he asserts that 'in the second temptation it is not probable that they left the wilderness, but that Satan was allowed to suggest to our Lord's mind the place, and the marvel that could be wrought there.' Similarly, the 'kingdoms of the world' were seen 'with the mental vision of One who knew all things.' Very different is the reverent reserve of Prof. Sanday a generation later (Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, ii. p. 612): 'It is impossible for us to understand it, in the sense of understanding how what we call temptation could affect the Son of God. It could not have touched Him at all unless He had been also, and no less really, Son of Man.'

trials. The forty days of Messiah's sojourn were the miniature image of those ancient forty years; and his fast corresponded to the types supplied by Moses and Elijah. Hunger had again and again driven the Israelites almost to revolt; they, too, had tempted or tried Yahweh at Massah ('trial-place,' cp. *Exod.* 17^{7}, *Deut.* 6^{16}); they, too, had relapsed into idolatry, and in the later Jewish ideas idolatry was identical with the worship of the devil. Here, then, were all the elements only awaiting their combination in fresh forms to portray in dramatic colloquy with his great antagonist the effort of Satan to get Messiah in his power: here was a complete specimen of the myth in its purest shape,—an imaginative symbol of a moral idea which instinctively sought to communicate itself to others with the help of external form.

Three parts were devoted by Strauss to the discussion of the birth and childhood of Jesus, his public life, and his passion, death, and resurrection. At the outset he declared that he did not mean to assert that the whole history of Jesus was to be represented as mythical, but only that every part of it was to be subjected to a critical examination. At the close, however, he described his own work as a perfect revel of destruction:

'The results of the inquiry which we have now brought to a close, have apparently annihilated the greatest and most valuable part of that which the Christian has been wont to believe concerning his Saviour Jesus, have uprooted all the animating motives which he has gathered from his faith, and withered all his consolations. The boundless store of truth and life which for

eighteen centuries has been the aliment of humanity, seems irretrievably dissipated; the most sublime levelled with the dust, God divested of his grace, man of his dignity, and the tie between heaven and earth broken' (concluding Dissertation, § 144).

This broken tie, however, he proceeded to reunite on speculative grounds, or, in his own words, 'to re-establish dogmatically that which has been destroyed critically.' Into that process we need not follow him; it was the justification of the announcement of his preface, 'The author is perfectly aware that the essence of the Christian faith is perfectly independent of his criticism; the supernatural birth of Christ, his miracles, his resurrection and ascension, remain eternal truths, whatever doubts may be cast on their reality as historic facts.' This was, in fact, the object of his whole book, to apply to the Gospels the speculative forms of the Hegelian doctrine of the Incarnation, in which humanity took the place of the individual. For this end, the actual personality of Jesus, his character, his teachings, seemed of such small account that they could be almost wholly ignored.[1] When the miraculous was dissolved, nothing was left which appealed to him as significant, for he justly observed that the rationalist Christology, while creating no difficulty to the understanding, did not account for the Christ in whom the Church believes, and this was the Christ

[1] Thus, after analysing the Sermon on the Mount, he says (p. 342): 'The discourses of Jesus, like fragments of granite, could not be dissolved by the flood of oral tradition; but they were not seldom torn from their natural connexion, floated away from their original situation, and deposited in places to which they did not properly belong.'

whom he set out to save. His failure to recognise the value of the historical residuum, and to present it as of any worth to his readers, left upon those who could not accept his speculative reconstruction a sense of blank desolation. The Jesus whom they knew and loved, seemed to have disappeared entirely.

Strauss himself could not realise this. He no doubt sincerely believed that he had rendered a service to religion by showing the Church a way out of its conflict with science and philosophy; he was deeply wounded by the storm of opposition which his book excited, and with almost youthful fury—he was but seven-and-twenty when he plunged into the strife—he fell upon his critics in his replies.[1] The controversy died away, but not without leaving deep and abiding traces. The main defect of the book, beneath its theory of the manufacture of a Messianic biography out of Old Testament elements, lay in the insufficiency of its treatment of the Gospel records. It attempted to construct an elaborate system of historical criticism without any prior investigation into the literary origins, contents, and relations, of the documents on which the whole was founded. Strauss had been so preoccupied with his philosophical aim, that he had not thought it worth while to trouble himself with the positive facts.[2] Just as Mrs. Browning complained that Dr. Johnson

[1] Dr. Fairbairn, *Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 244, quotes sufficient illustrations.

[2] Contrast, for example, such a modern work as Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*.

wrote the 'Lives of the Poets' and left out the poets, so it might be said of Strauss that he wrote the 'Life of Christ' and omitted Jesus. His book made an epoch; but before it could be properly appreciated the study of the origins of Christianity must pass through long and winding paths.[1]

Especially was it needful, in order to escape from the purely destructive method of Strauss, that the criticism of the Gospel history should be based on

[1] A few words may be added here by way of illustration concerning one of the books evoked by Strauss's attack, the *Life of Jesus* by Neander, published in 1837 (English translation from the fourth German edition, 1852). Associated in Berlin (1812) with De Wette and Schleiermacher, he had long been occupied with his great work on Church History, when Strauss entered the field. The Prussian Government proposed to place the obnoxious book under ban, but Neander protested; 'Let it be answered by argument, not by authority' (quoted by Fairbairn, p. 242). After a year's labour he was ready with his reply. He naturally proceeded from the critical basis of his earlier treatises on the *Planting of Christianity*, etc., and in this respect did little to correct the one-sidedness of Strauss. He minimised some of the miracles; the star which brought the Magi in search of the infant Christ was an astrological sign; the water at Cana was not changed into real wine but only received powers capable of producing the same effects; Paulus's view of the feeding of the five thousand was a possible one,—examples of the like are not wanting in the Middle Ages—yet the details of the narrative were irreconcilable with such a hypothesis; the Transfiguration was a vision in sleep, with the candid admission, 'Still the difficulty remains, that the phenomena, if simply psychological, should have appeared to all the three Apostles in the same form.' Well might Strauss propose for the motto of such a treatise, 'Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief.' On the other hand, the miracles occupied quite a subordinate place in the general presentment of Christ's ministry. Neander's idea of a Life of Christ involved an attempt to delineate his teaching both in its essential aims and in its relation to contemporary parties and ideas; and the fulness and care of his exposition are in marked contrast with the meagre treatment of Strauss (Part II. chap. vi.). But on this side Baur not unjustly criticised it afterwards for its weakness in the treatment of the Fourth Gospel (*Kritische Untersuchungen über die Kanonischen Evangelien*, 1847, p. 52).

the criticism of the documents which are its sources.[1] This was, in fact, undertaken by Weisse in 1838, with the result already recorded.[2] He came to the conclusion, like Wilke in the same year, that the oldest and most original of the Gospels was to be found in Mark. To some extent he shared the mythical view of Strauss, but he saw in such narratives more of the creative spirit of Christianity, and less of the half-mechanical transference of Old Testament elements, than Strauss had been willing to allow. So he pointed the way of advance by his careful investigation of his authorities, as well as by his sympathetic recognition of the ideal values of the products of the consciousness of the Church. But a more definite criticism still was needed, which should attempt to ascertain the special characteristics of each book, to determine its chief literary features, to account for its peculiarities, to discover any traces of its special object, and fix the circumstances of time and place, the conditions of thought and life, in which it was composed. Every religious author bears some relation to the beliefs and hopes of his age, to its struggles and parties and interests. What evidence exists that such influences were at work in the communities out of which the Gospels issued, what was their nature, and how did they operate upon the records? The first person

[1] Baur's clear-sightedness saw this at once, *Die Kanonischen Evangelien*, p. 41. Cp. Pfleiderer, *Development of Theology*, p. 225.

[2] See *ante*, p. 235.

seriously to raise such questions and supply an answer, was Ferdinand Christian Baur.[1]

III.

Like many another great German scholar, Baur was able to cover an amazing range of study. While still a master at Blaubeuren he had produced as early as 1824 a treatise on the natural religion of antiquity.[2] His appointment to a chair at Tübingen led him to choose the early history of Christianity as his especial field of research, and in the year in which Strauss began the issue of his *Leben Jesu*, Baur published two treatises which might seem at first sight unrelated to each other, yet were really in the closest connexion. The first was an investigation into the strange forms of speculation in the second century of our era commonly known as Gnosticism ;[3] the second dealt with the origin and significance of the 'Pastoral Epistles.'[4] The Gnostic (the term is believed to have come into use at the beginning of the second century) regarded himself as possessed of a special *gnosis* or knowledge of divine things, imparted originally by Jesus to his apostles, and

[1] A fine description of Baur's theological development will be found in Fairbairn's *Place of Christ in Modern Theol.*, Book I. div. II. chap. iii. In the sketch here offered for the general reader, attention is directed only to his treatment of the Gospels.

[2] *Symbolik und Mythologie, oder die Natur-Religion des Alterthums*, Stuttgart, 1824-25, in three volumes.

[3] *Die Christliche Gnosis*, 1835.

[4] *Die sogenannten Pastoral-Briefe*, 1835.

transmitted by them in a secret tradition. There was no fixed form to such an esoteric doctrine. It could take up into itself elements from the most various sources; it could be shaped and moulded into ever fresh combinations by the individual genius of successive teachers. Coming into historic view first in Asia Minor, it speedily makes a home for itself in two great centres of Christian thought, Antioch and Alexandria. But its influence was not limited to these cities. Its different types of teaching were very widely diffused. They were strong enough to contend for mastery with the Church which was gradually elaborating a rule of faith and a doctrine of tradition with which to encounter its rivals. The latter part of the second century witnessed the Church's triumph over a danger which had threatened its very existence. In the conception of Catholic unity a bulwark was reared against the invaders. This unity was attested by the possession of a common doctrine, a deposit of faith, preserved in the Churches which had been founded by apostles. The movement for the formation of a canon of New Testament Scriptures to set beside the Old, and the recognition of an order of bishops who continued the apostolic teaching, constituted a two-fold defence against irresponsible and lawless speculation. Here was a guarantee of the steadiness and permanence of Christian truth.

Now Baur was the first to put the startling but suggestive question, 'Are there any traces of this wide-spread mode of thought in the New Testa-

ment?' And his second treatise on the Pastoral Epistles supplied the answer. The false teachers denounced in the letters to Timothy and Titus were the Gnostics. Moreover it was possible to identify a particular school which the writer in one passage, at any rate, had in view. Among the most influential of the Gnostic sects was that of Marcion. Born in Pontus in Asia Minor, he came to Rome about the middle of the second century, where he taught in succession to a Syrian Gnostic named Cerdo. He himself travelled widely, and his followers spread through the East as far as Persia. The earliest known inscription over a Christian place of worship belonged to a Marcionite 'synagogue' in a Syrian village, and is dated in a year corresponding with 318 A.D. The community was numerous, strictly ascetic, and distinguished for the faithfulness and multitude of its martyrs. Among the works in which Marcion embodied his teaching was a treatise called the 'Antitheses' or 'Oppositions.' It was founded on a series of contrasts between the God depicted in the Old Testament who walked in the Garden of Eden, and was obliged to visit Sodom personally in order to know the truth of the report of its wickedness, and the God revealed by Jesus who was the author of redemption. The God whose law ran 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' could not be identical with the God in whose name Jesus taught 'If any smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also.' The God of the Old Testament might be a just God; the God of

the New was good. Now at the close of the first letter to Timothy, the writer utters the warning, 6^{20}, 'O Timothy, guard the deposit, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called.' What were the 'oppositions of the knowledge'? The Greek, 'Antitheses of the Gnosis,' pointed to the title of Marcion's book.

Here, then, was strong confirmation of the suggestion that the Pastoral Epistles really originated in the struggle of the Church with Gnosticism in the second century. And this view seemed to explain other peculiarities in them, notably their emphasis on the office and character of the bishop. The more highly developed ecclesiastical system had already been found incongruous with the apostolic age.[1] It was quite in place when the Church was endeavouring to establish its tradition and its hierarchy against the heretics. But this discovery (as Baur regarded it) really introduced a new method into New Testament criticism. It founded itself on an external fact known from independent writers, and it sought to test a small group of documents by their relation to a severe and long-continued conflict, the evidence of which was copious and beyond dispute. A wide general conception of a great historic process was thus brought to bear on certain portions of what had hitherto been regarded as a product of the Apostolic age. Could any similar clues be

[1] The authenticity of 1 *Tim.* was denied by Schleiermacher; and of all three Pastoral letters by Eichhorn.

found to determine the position of any other books? The question was not new to Baur. Four years before, in 1831, he had published an essay entitled *Die Christuspartei in der Korinthischen Gemeinde.* It was the result of his lectures on the Epistles to the Corinthians, and was designed to prove that Paul had been confronted in Corinth with a Jewish Christian party which disputed his claim on behalf of the Gentiles, and sought to impose the ancient obligations of the Mosaic law. This opposition revealed itself also in the literature of the Apostolic age; and it was destined to become in Baur's hands the key to the history of the early Church.

From the Pastoral Letters and the Gnosticism of the second century Baur worked his way back to the career of Paul, delineated on the one hand in his own letters, and on the other hand in the book of *Acts*. The letters of the Apostle, of which Baur admitted four as undoubtedly genuine, *Galatians*, *1* and *2 Corinthians,* and *Romans*, were the earliest documents of the New Testament. They were older than any of the Gospels, and the value of their witness could neither be exaggerated nor impeached. They constituted an imperishable monument to the Apostle, they were an abiding proof of his importance for the whole development of Christianity. For it was Paul who first insisted on the universal nature of the Gospel. He freed Christianity from the dead hand of Judaism. He elaborated the great argument that Messiah's death abolished for ever the sovereignty of the Law; and

represented the Gospel—not as a mere Messianic faith in which the purpose of Judaism was continued and fulfilled, and the ancient institutions were still maintained—but as a new life, taking the place of the old system, and doing away with its legal dues and mechanical morality. For the Gentile Christian, therefore, to take upon himself the obligations of the Law was needlessly to entangle himself in a yoke of bondage. But this was precisely what the Jewish party desired to enforce. When Peter came down to Antioch, after Paul and Barnabas had received the right hand of fellowship from the 'Pillar apostles' at Jerusalem, he at first freely ate with the uncircumcised Gentile Christians.[1] But the appearance of representatives from James, following the more rigid rule of separation, led Peter to withdraw from the broader position which he had at first been willing to assume. His conduct implied that he no longer admitted the Gentile Christians to the same privileges as the Christian Jews. To Paul this seemed like treachery to Christ; no righteousness of the law could bring salvation; and to compel the Gentiles to live like Jews was to be false to the life of faith in the Son of God. With vehement remonstrance he challenged Peter before the assembled Church, and the breach between them, argued Baur, was never healed. So fierce was the strife of principles that the apostle who believed himself entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, was pursued from place to place by the emissaries of

[1] *Gal.* 2^{12}.

the Jewish Christian party. They endangered his successes in Galatia; they stirred up dissension at Corinth. They spoke with the authority of those who had been the personal companions of Jesus, and had therefore a special right to direct the movement which he had inaugurated; and they boldly challenged the apostolic character of the great missionary to the Gentiles. They even brought letters of commendation, no doubt from the leaders at Jerusalem, which indicated the wide-spread nature of the conflict, and the efforts made by the Judaisers to secure the control of the churches.

The conception, therefore, which Baur formed of the early history of Christianity centred in this impassioned struggle. The founder of the Christian 'way' had himself been a Jew; he had habitually worshipped with his people; he had kept their feasts; he had hardly ever left his native soil; he had never openly made a definite breach with his hereditary religion. His followers had been men of the same race. They clung to their Messianic faith with ardent conviction; they could not be expected lightly to forego their privileges as children of Abraham; and they adhered to the narrow and rigid position of men who believed that Messiah had appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and would soon return to bestow on them the promised kingdom. Over against them stood the Apostle Paul, with his deep inward conviction of a calling no less real than theirs. If they had known Christ after the flesh, it had pleased the Father to reveal

his Son in him. The warrant for his mission to the Gentiles came every whit as direct from Christ himself as their own right to be the ministers of the circumcision; and the long tale of his converts was the justification of his claim. Thus the progress of Christianity followed the formula of the Hegelian philosophy. Advance in one direction produced reaction in another. Over against the stringency of the Law appeared the liberty of the Gospel. In technical language, development took place by antithesis; where, then, was the reconciliation of these opposite principles?

Paul disappears in the shadows cast by the great Neronian conflagration; and Peter passes, and there is no compromise. But little by little the rival parties draw together. Baptism acquires its place as the way of admission into the Church, and the demand for circumcision is silently dropped. The less rigorous of the Jewish Christians admit the Gentiles to fellowship with them; the Pauline mission does the great work of conversion; the synagogue supplies the forms of organisation; and faith begins to go hand in hand with works. A process of reconciliation makes its slow way among the divided parties; and the second century witnesses the formation of the Catholic Church where Peter and Paul at last stand side by side at Rome as joint partakers in the work for Christ. The evidence of this movement is found in the literature both within and without the New Testament. Each stage of it is reflected in some work produced under

its influence. To each book in turn Baur puts the question 'On which side do you stand in the long strife? What relation do you bear to the Petrine or the Pauline party?' This attitude gave to each document its tendency or *Tendenz*. The results are often startling, for the greater part of the canonical literature after the days of Paul is carried down into the second century. But while the documents of the faith are thus judged according to their approximation to the Pauline or the Petrine principles, Baur is always searching for points of contact with external history, and his view of the origin of the Gospels, to which our attention must be limited, depends on two considerations: (1) is it possible by mutual comparison to determine their order and characteristics? and (2) are there any clues by which the positive dates of any of them can be established?[1]

The Gospels formed the subjects of a series of essays the publication of which began in the *Theologische Jahrbücher* in 1844. These investigations were issued in 1847 in a volume entitled 'Critical Investigations on the Canonical Gospels.'[2] The opening Essay on the Fourth Gospel at once settles the precedence of all the other three. Among the Synoptics two tests are immediately available; (1) Does any of them show dependence on the others,

[1] For purposes of simplification nothing is here said of the numerous works of Baur's pupils, or the differences of opinion which arose within the Tübingen School.

[2] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Kanonischen Evangelien*, Tübingen 1847.

and, if so, (2) How far is this confirmed by its sympathy with the narrower or the wider view of Christianity? There remains the further question: (3) What means exist for fixing the place of any of them not only in the order of succession but also in actual chronology? Tradition, then, was frankly set aside. So far as the citation of the four Gospels by name is concerned, they are never seen together till the second half of the second century. They none of them definitely bear any author's name: and in the case of the first two in our Canon, *Matthew* and *Mark*, the books which have descended to us differ so widely from the descriptions of the works attributed to these Evangelists by Papias, that it is not possible (argued Baur) to suppose that they are the same. A point was thus reached from which investigation could make a new departure. Its results may be briefly summarised as follows.

First in the field stood *Matthew*. Written in Greek, and sometimes citing the Old Testament from the Greek version of the LXX, it could not be identified with the apostolic record to which Papias testified, known even in Jerome's day as the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.[1] This vanished Gospel stood behind our Gospel as its original. What interval separated the two, and how many literary stages intervened, could only be matter of conjecture. But the Gospel itself bore evidence of its late production, for it was full of incongruities, and presented

[1] The extant fragments of this Gospel were collected and published in his country, by Mr. E. B. Nicholson, with valuable annotations, in 1879.

different views in peaceful juxtaposition. On the one hand it imposed the absolute significance and enduring validity of the Mosaic Law, 5^{17-18}:

'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.'[1]

On the other it never mentioned circumcision, but in 28^{19} enjoined baptism as the mode of entry into Messiah's kingdom. In 15^{24} the mission of Jesus is limited to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel'; but in numerous passages (such as 8^{11-12}, 25^{31-46}, 26^{13}, 28^{19}) the Gospel plainly stands for universalist Christianity. Still, the repeated endeavours to prove the Messianic function of Jesus from prophecy, and even to expound his sufferings as divinely pre-ordained, proved that the Gospel issued from the Jewish side. Nothing could show this more clearly than the birth-story and the account of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem in the character of Son of David, 21^{9}; though the Gospel itself reported an argument with the Pharisees, 22^{41-46}, in which Jesus apparently contended that Davidic descent was not needful for Messiah. The presence of these various elements lifted the Gospel above the range of mere partizanship. It did, indeed,

[1] It is noteworthy that Baur did not press the words of *Matt.* 23^{2-3}, 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all things therefore, whatsoever they bid you, *these* do and observe.' These have been sometimes understood to enjoin obedience to the vast accumulations of scribal tradition, as well as the obligations of the written Law. Baur regards them only as used to point the contrast between the Pharisaic demands and the Pharisees' own conduct, 'do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not.'

present most clearly of the Synoptic Three the side of Christianity which had grown up with Judaism; but it did so with the frank admission of elements which indicated that the reconciliation of party strife had been long at work. A positive date for the narrative as we have it was found in the language of the great eschatological discourse upon the Mount of Olives. The 'abomination of desolation . . . standing in the holy place,' 24^{15}, was identified with a statue of Jupiter Capitolinus erected by Hadrian on the site of the Temple; and the persecutions against the Christians were due to Barkokhba who was furious with them because they would not join in a hopeless rising against Rome. By this interpretation a definite date was obtained for the Gospel within the narrow limits of 130-134 A.D.[1]

Following the order of Griesbach and Schleiermacher, Baur placed *Luke* next to *Matthew*. This was on the face of it Pauline in character; but the divergence was so strongly marked as almost to place it in an antithetic relation to the presentation of the Gospel story in *Matthew*. Consider only the manner in which the apostolate of the Twelve is thrown into the shade beside the wider mission of the Seventy. How brief and scanty is the address to the Twelve in $9^{3\text{-}5}$ compared with the fulness of the discourse in *Matt.* 10! And what is the meaning of this contrast? The despatch of the Seventy is no historical event in the earthly career

[1] See the long note, pp. 605-609.

of Jesus. It is an emblem of the preaching to the Gentiles who were distributed (according to Jewish tradition founded on the table of Noah's descendants in *Gen.* 10) into seventy nations.[1] This is the reason why they are sent forth on the last journey to Jerusalem. The time is at hand for Messiah to pass into the heavenly life, 9^{51}. The Master is on his way to Jerusalem through Samaria, 9^{52}: he is already among those who are not Jews. But the Samaritans are not the real inhabitants of 'every city and place whither he himself is about to come'; it is to the dwellers in all lands far and near that the ascended Jesus comes by the Spirit. The subjection of the demons, the fall of Satan from heaven, typify the triumph of the Gospel over the idol-gods: and in transferring to this great effort the language which *Matthew* assigns to a specifically Jewish mission (10^{5} 'Go not into *any* way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans'), *Luke* enforces in the most emphatic manner the Pauline principle of universalism. Especially when the weighty words of *Matt.* 10^{40} 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me,' are applied in *Luke* 10^{16} to this second despatch —'He that heareth you heareth me, and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me, and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me,'—does the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles receive its highest sanction, and the great aim of Paul is fully

[1] Cp. Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, p. 332; he cites Schneckenburger and Gieseler in support.

vindicated. Yet if Jesus had really made such provision in advance, how could the Jewish party have been so unfaithful to it? That the Gospel took up into itself certain Jewish elements, such as the birth-story, the entry into Jerusalem, and the declaration of the permanence of the law, 16^{17},[1] was really due to the fact that its canonical form was the result of a very late redaction. The original *Luke*, employed by Marcion, who recognised no other Gospel, was supposed to have been unencumbered by these contradictions; not till the middle of the second century were these additions made, the preface written, and the whole work thrown into the shape in which the Church has preserved it.

Last of the Synoptic series came *Mark*. Ignoring the literary investigations of Weisse and Wilke, Baur thought it sufficient to lay down the broad proposition that as almost the whole Gospel with the exception of a few verses could be found in the other two, its secondary origin could not be doubted. Confirmation of this was found in a comparison of parallels such as the following:

Matt. 16^{28}.	*Mark* 9^{1}.
Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.	Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand *by*, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.

The personal hope of Messiah's advent expressed

[1] Baur conjectured (p. 508) that the true reading was 'my words': Lipsius suggested 'my law.' On Marcion's reading cp. Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.* ii. col. 1864.

in the first passage has died away before the composition of the second. In its place is substituted the progress of 'the kingdom,' that is, the advance of the Church. In such modifications as these did Baur find the real aim of the author. He had no fresh contribution to make to the reality of the Gospel story; he could only, therefore, have written in the interest of a specific *Tendenz*. What this was, it is not hard to discover. Three main points distinguish its compilation. He omits the birth-stories; he passes over the Sermon on the Mount; he ignores all the peculiarities of *Luke* in contrast with *Matthew*. The first is partly explained by the conjecture that Mark worked on the pre-Marcionite *Luke* which did not contain the birth-story. For the second a reason is found in the strange suggestion that the compiler sought to avoid recognising the permanent validity of the Mosaic law enforced in *Matt.* $5^{17\text{-}18}$, as if it was necessary to drop the entire discourse because of one specific passage. The excision of characteristic features in *Luke*, such as the opening sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth, the mission of the Seventy, or the parable of the Prodigal Son, is balanced by slight omissions from *Matthew*. The promise to the Apostles, *Matt.* 19^{28}, that they shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, is silently suppressed. So, also, is the limitation of the apostolic mission to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' *Matt.* $10^{5\text{-}6}$. The similar restriction in the reply of Jesus to the Syro-Phœnician woman, *Matt.* 15^{24}, disappears in *Mark*

$17^{26\text{-}30}$: and *Mark* 11^{17} adds the words 'for all the nations' which *Matt.* 21^{13} fails to reproduce from *Is.* 56^{7}. The Pauline principle, therefore, is not unknown, nor does it pass wholly unrecognised. But it is not prominently enforced; from the point of view of *Tendenz* the Gospel is indifferent and neutral. In other words, it has a mediating and reconciling aim; and as such it must be reckoned last of the Three, and find its place somewhere in the middle of the second century.

The tradition of the ancient Church and the united voice of modern scholarship regarded the Fourth Gospel as posterior to the Synoptics. With this view Baur entirely concurred; but the dates to which he assigned the former group inevitably brought the Johannine presentation later still. To the analysis of this problem Baur devoted all his skill;[1] and his exposition had a lasting effect. Doubts of the Apostolic authorship had been raised at the opening of the century by Vogel; and the foundations of the newer criticism were firmly laid by Bretschneider in 1820, in his *Probabilia*.[2] Strauss had not examined the question critically, and wavered in successive editions of the Life, though in the fourth (1840) he reverted to the view that the discourses could not be regarded as historical, and were mainly, in fact, free compositions of the

[1] The essays on *John* occupy pp. 79-389 of the *Kritische Untersuchungen*.

[2] *Probabilia de Evang. et Epp. Joan. indole et origine.* Bretschneider was 'General Superintendent' in Gotha (1816-1848), and much respected for his learning, industry, and moderation. See Lect. VII.

Evangelist.[1] In general, however, the authority of Schleiermacher had prevailed to secure for the Gospel, as the only record by an Apostle, the central place in Christian truth. This position Baur now under took to examine. The main idea of the whole representation lay for him in the Prologue, which opened with the delineation of the timeless existence of the Word with God. In choosing this mode of expression for his Christian consciousness, the Evangelist at once placed himself in relation with Greek thought. But Baur did not immediately dwell on the significance of this for the expansion of Christianity, or the transfusion of its teachings into Hellenism; he passed at once to the ideal significance thus imparted to the career of Christ. When the Word became flesh in the person of Jesus, the divine principle of life and light entered the world of space and time. There it immediately encountered the oppositions of darkness and death, and Messiah's ministry is so portrayed as to exhibit a whole series of moral and spiritual antitheses, between truth and falsehood, belief and disbelief, the seeing and the blind, the children of God and the children of the devil. Scene after scene is passed under review and compared with the Synoptic presentations. The result shows that the book is not a mere assemblage of traditions, a series of anecdotic reminiscences, many of which add little to the total impression of the rest. On the other hand, it is a carefully planned composition, having such unity

[1] Engl. transl., 2nd ed., p. 386.

that its parts are all essential to the whole. But from this point of view it is not a historical record. It is a delineation of the inner purport of Christianity thrown into biographic form, but conceived at a spiritual elevation in which the previous struggles of Jewish and Gentile elements are lost in a loftier harmony. Neither in Jerusalem nor on Mount Gerizim[1] shall men worship the Father: the true worshippers are they who worship in spirit and in truth. In the language of philosophy, Christianity was thus presented as the absolute religion. Judaism was, indeed, its precursor; and the Scriptures of the Old Testament announced Messiah's day. Nay, they even foretold the death which would complete and so abolish the dispensation of the past; and when, upon the cross, Jesus cried 'It is finished,' he dismissed the law, and the new life of grace and truth began. This was the ideal meaning of that difference of date for the day of the Crucifixion between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel which had given the harmonists so many searchings of heart. In the Johannine narrative Jesus ate no Passover. He himself died at the time when the lambs were being slain in the Temple. He was thus the true Paschal sacrifice, and was identified in that character by the writer's application of the ancient ritual precept, 19^{36}. When the water and the blood flowed from his side, these were the recognised symbols of the Spirit (comp. $7^{38\,39}$), and of the death by which that gift was to become available for all mankind.

[1] Samaria was the accepted type of heathenism.

The Gospel was thus a delineation of the true Christian *Gnosis* (cp. 17^{3}); and its truth was not historical but ideal. To Baur it appeared incredible, after his examination of the inner motives and principles of the work, that it could be regarded as the work of an actual companion of Jesus, still more of John who appeared in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians in close association with the leaders of the Jewish party, James and Peter. Moreover, the question was complicated with two other issues. In the latter part of the second century a controversy broke out in the Church in Asia Minor concerning the proper day for the celebration of Easter, which was of course determined by the antecedent observance of the Paschal feast. Synods were held and letters were written; and finally, Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, formally pleaded the cause of the Asiatic Churches in a communication addressed to Victor, bishop of Rome. In the interpretation which Baur placed on this dispute, the essence of the matter lay in this: Polycrates, and the churches which he represented, appealed to long tradition including the practice of the Apostle John at Ephesus in favour of a usage corresponding with the Synoptic representation. With this the Fourth Gospel was in open variance. How, then, could it be assigned to the Apostle who had regularly followed the contrary reckoning? Along another line also the verdict of tradition was weighty. Of no book in the New Testament was the external attestation so secure as the Book of Revela-

tion. The witness of antiquity unanimously ascribed it to the son of Zebedee; yet if John wrote the Apocalypse, nothing could be more certain than that he did not also write the Gospel.

IV.

Such were some of the results of the famous Tübingen criticism. Nothing, perhaps, more signally proved the genius of Baur than the number of distinguished pupils who eagerly ranged themselves by his side, or the immense stimulus which he gave to almost every department of historical theology. With unwearied activity he himself traversed the vast fields of dogmatics and ecclesiastical history; he wrote great monographs on doctrines like the Trinity and the Atonement; he traced the development of Christianity down to the philosophies of the first half of the nineteenth century. This varied labour, however, could not be sustained beneath the burden of advancing years. In 1860 he died, but not before a movement had already set in for which the labours of the previous decades had been the preparation. A new problem was coming into view, or rather the old problem under a fresh aspect. In throwing the Gospels into the second century, Baur was driven to explain them as the products of the Church. But of what was the Church itself the product? Its form might be due to the reconciliation of opposing principles. But what had called these principles into activity? You might

account for the variations in the Gospels by the tendencies of different parties, and the sympathies of their authors with the schools of Jewish or of Gentile thought. But how could you explain the Gospel? In other words, the work of Baur and his followers was only preliminary; behind the Church, behind Peter and Paul, lay Jesus. What of him?

The time was ripening for the great series of the lives of Jesus which marked the years immediately following Baur's death. It was opened, in fact, by Ewald of Göttingen in 1855.[1] He had many qualifications for the task. Profoundly imbued with the prophetic spirit, and withal a student of minute detail, the whole sources of Israel's history were open to him. He had issued in 1850 a translation and synoptic commentary on the First Three Gospels. In a series of monographs he dealt with the apocalyptic literature too long neglected; though this important witness to the state of Jewish hope left singularly little trace on the main body of the work.[2] That work was marred by some of his defects as a historian. His judgments seem often arbitrary and fanciful; and he cannot conceal his scorn for those who differ from him. The Tübingen wisdom is a disordered dream: Mark is the earliest, not the last, of the Synoptics, and the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel is a fact entirely

[1] The fifth vol. in German, the sixth in English, of his *History of Israel*.

[2] Not one of the passages in which Jesus predicts the coming of the Son of Man, is even named.

certain. In cases of conflict between the Fourth and the First Three, the latter are unhesitatingly set aside. With John, therefore, he places the expulsion of the money changers from the Temple at the outset of the ministry, instead of at its close; and Jesus dies on the same day as the Paschal lamb. This preference for the Johannine record involves the attempt to harmonise its different conceptions with those of the Synoptic group, a process impossible to effect without distinct injury to the crises which mark their narrative; and though he clearly perceives, as so eminent a critic could not fail to do, the unity of the Johannine scheme, he is obliged again and again to break it up to accommodate the episodes of another story. Yet he constantly betrays his consciousness that the value of the Fourth Gospel lies in its symbols rather than its facts; but in his inability to frame clear ideas of what actually happened he wraps the scene in a cloud of enthusiastic verbiage, and the real personality of the Teacher disappears in golden haze. One signal merit, however, marks the book. The rise of Christianity is treated as a part of the history of Israel.[1] Without appeal to an abandoned interpretation of prophecy, Jesus is set in organic connexion with the thought and life of his race: and whatever ideal founded on Christian dogma may dwell in the background, not all the exalted language in which his Messianic consciousness is described ever leads the reader to forget that Jesus and his disciples alike were Jews.

[1] Ewald apparently argues for the birth in Bethlehem; but on the Miraculous Conception he is silent.

Very different was the *Vie de Jésus* of Ernest Renan, first published in June, 1863. Every one who cared to do so, might know the story of the ex-seminarist of Tréguier, appointed by imperial decree in the preceding year (1862) to the Chair of Hebrew in the College of France, and then suspended after his opening lecture. He had already conducted an archæological mission in Phœnicia, and there in the companionship of the sister Henriette who had loved him so passionately and sacrificed so much for him, the preliminary studies for his book were made. On the eve of their departure for France after a year of unremitting labour, the brother and sister were stricken with malaria. They were carried unconscious from the house, and laid out for dead in the midst of Eastern mourners. But after more than two days' swoon Renan awoke, an hour before his sister died. He was placed in a litter and carried on board ship: his sister lay under the palms at Amshit. She had said that she would love the book, because they had done it together. In words of exquisite tenderness he dedicated it to her memory. Did her pure influence abide with him, while he spent a year, as he afterwards said, in toning it down? At any rate this book was free from those flashes of passionate irony or flippant levity which sometimes disfigured his later writings; and these impulses, says Madame Darmesteter, Henriette had not loved.[1]

It is impossible in few words to characterise, as it deserves, this famous book. The charm of its

[1] *Ernest Renan* (1897), p. 146

style, the daring originality of its treatment, sent a thrill through Europe. By November 60,000 copies were in circulation, and the author told Mr. Mountstuart E. Grant Duff that there were already two translations in Dutch, two in German, and one in Italian.[1] The Empress Eugénie, who was believed to have urged his suspension, with remarkable good sense refused to try to stop the publication. She said to one of her ladies, Mme. Cornu,[2] 'It will do no harm to those who believe in Christ, and to those who do not, it will do good.' It was a wise judgment—for France. For Renan's work had the great merit that it made Jesus conceivable by thousands who had cared nothing for him before. He brought his hero out of the sanctuary; he was no more veiled from mortal sight by the incense of worship or the creeds of the Church; he was a man, who conceived a great idea, but was prevented from realising it by the resistance which he encountered, and beneath which he fell. Renan, therefore, presented Jesus no longer as a sacred mystery, but as a person to be understood, like any other high creative genius. Doubtless the attempt to understand him required profound and delicate insight. But for this task Renan had his own qualifications. He had himself believed and doubted, he had reflected and suffered, but to one service he had always remained constant, the service of truth. This book had been

[1] *Ernest Renan* (1895), p. 69. Another followed in English before the close of the year.

[2] Who repeated it to Mr. Grant Duff, p. 70.

studied on the spot; it was steeped in the sunshine of the East; the atmosphere of oriental faith pervaded it; much of it had been written on the mud floor of a Syrian cottage. He has himself recorded how the aspects of the country, its localities, its ever varying scenery, its people, became to him a kind of fifth Gospel knitting together the impressions which he derived from the New Testament. Defective in its critical grasp—he afterwards largely modified the use which he first made of the Fourth Gospel[1]—the narrative began as a kind of Galilean romance. But with the influence of the Baptist on Jesus a new Messianic phase followed, which finally deepened into tragedy as the preacher of the kingdom found himself involved in conflicts with inferior natures which inevitably lowered him to their level. The evidence of this theory of decline in the spiritual purity of Jesus was partly founded on the increasing use of the imagery of a great divine catastrophe; and it reached its most offensive point when Renan hinted that the resurrection of Lazarus was due to an arrangement contrived by Mary and Martha to which Jesus accommodated himself to win support at the approaching crisis.[2] The result was neither history nor poetry, though it savoured of both. It did not recognise the difficulty that the materials are too scanty for a biography in the ordinary sense of the term.

[1] See the preface to the thirteenth edition, and the later volume *Les Évangiles.*

[2] This was subsequently altered.

Nor did its paradoxical certainty admit how large a part of its psychological construction was the product of a sympathetic imagination uncontrolled by facts. Nevertheless it rendered signal service by focussing the attention of educated Europe upon the problem. And the strength of the writer's own homage to the career which he had sought to describe, may be inferred from glowing words on the last page of his volume: 'Whatever may be the unexpected phenomena of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. . . All the ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there has not been born one greater than Jesus.'

Very different both in tone and method was the *New Life of Jesus* with which Strauss appealed to the educated reader in January, 1864.[1] It was expressly prepared for the German people, and was nearly completed when the *Vie de Jésus* appeared. To that work Strauss proffered the hand of fellowship. He did not attempt to emulate its merits; and he knew that peculiarities by which he hoped to earn the approbation of his own countrymen, would only cause weariness on the other side of the Rhine. He left his own plan as it was first designed: but he added, 'All I wish is to have written a book as suitable for Germany as Renan's is for France.'[2] Thirty years had modified some of his early views; but his main conception of the mythical character of many of the Gospel narratives remained unchanged. The

[1] On Schenkel's *Charakterbild Jesu* which preceded it by a few weeks, see Lect. VI.

[2] *English Transl.* 1865, i. p. xviii.

method of presentment, however, was considerably altered. The attempt to combine a historical investigation with a particular philosophic and dogmatic conception is dropped; the reader is no longer bewildered by a dialectical process for establishing as eternal truths ideas which have first been rejected in the form of events as historically false. A long and elaborate introduction discussed the Gospel sources, and thus removed the reproach which had been justly brought against the earlier treatise. This was not unnaturally based on the Tübingen researches. No certain traces could be discovered of the existence of our First Three Gospels in their present form, till towards the middle of the second century. *Matthew* most clearly bore the stamp of Jewish nationality, and reported the teachings of Jesus—though not unmixed with later additions and modifications—in a purer form than either of the others. *Luke* was deeply marked with the Pauline tendency to universalism; while *Mark*, the latest of the three, was reduced to a mere colourless abstract through the impartial process of balancing each omission from *Matthew* on the Judaising side by the suppression of a corresponding Gentile element from *Luke*. With this mechanical style of criticism Strauss was curiously content; the new literary investigations which were to revolutionise the position of *Mark* were only just beginning.[1] On the Fourth Gospel he followed and defended Baur.

The discussion of the records was followed by a

[1] See Lect. VI.

'Historical Outline of the Life of Jesus.' It was in this section of the work that Strauss revealed the difference of the point of view from which he now approached his problem. The historical Jesus had not interested him before. Compared with the brilliant tints, the palpitating sentimentality, of Renan, the pages of Strauss are cold and dull. Yet he, too, strives to penetrate to the secret of Jesus, and finds it in the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. If there is any utterance in the New Testament which certainly came from his lips, it was this—'That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' This comprehensive love he attributed to God, because he found it first in his own heart; through this he felt himself one with his Father, and realised an inward blessedness which no outward want could ever disturb. Here was the key to his relations with the Law and the institutions of Israel on the one side, and with the larger world beyond upon the other. And here, too, was the essence of his Messianic conception of himself as 'Son of man.' In commenting on some misunderstood language of Baur on this subject, Strauss implicitly replies to Renan. Here is no patronage, no assumption of superior insight into psychologic truth: he will admit no hint of accommodation to a national ideal lower than his own highest: 'with a personality of such immeasurable historical effect, . . . there can be no question of playing a part':

'with such a personality every inch must have been conviction.'[1]

To this analysis of the character and conceptions of the real Jesus, Strauss added a survey of the mythical history. But he did not confine himself to a ruthless dissection of the narratives from the Birth to the Ascension; he undertook to account for their origins, and to trace the successive stages of their forms:

'The inspired Son of David becomes a Son of God begotten without a father; the Son of God becomes then the Creative Word that was made flesh; the miraculous physician, the friend of mankind, becomes one who raises the dead, the absolute monarch over nature and her laws; the wise teacher of the people, the prophet who looks into the hearts of men, becomes the Omniscient, God's *alter ego*; he who in his resurrection went up to God came also forth from God, had been in the beginning with God, and his earthly existence was only a short episode by which he interrupted his eternal existence with God for the benefit of men.'[2]

With this aim the second half of the book sought by a penetrating criticism to reach and expound the inner impulses out of which the unhistorical elements had arisen. It was an elaborate answer to the challenge of his critics, the justice of which he admitted: 'If any one denies the validity of a story generally believed, we have a right to demand from him not only the grounds of his opinion, but also an explanation of the process by which the unhistorical narrative arose.' Another generation has, in some respects, reached fresh points of view; but

[1] *Engl. Transl.* i. p. 312. [2] *Engl. Transl* i. p. 216.

the work which Strauss attempted in 1864 will hardly need to be done again.

One more effort was still to be made, though not without serious modifications, from the circle of the Tübingen ideas. In 1865 Dr. Theodor Keim of Zürich published an essay on the historical Christ; and two years later issued the first volume of his great treatise on *Jesus of Nazara* (1867-72). The Gospel problem was discussed afresh with much greater fulness and freedom than by Strauss. In the result Mark (as with Griesbach and Baur) still occupied the third place. But there was a significant movement away from the Tübingen dates. *Matthew* was written substantially before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70; *Mark*, on the other hand, related both to *Luke* and *John*,[1] was placed about 100; *Luke* occupied the interval, somewhere near 90; while the Fourth Gospel was denied (with Baur) to the apostle, but (against Baur) was placed in the earlier days of Gnosticism, between the years 110-115 A.D. The main part of the work, which reached an enormous bulk (the English translation covers 2353 closely printed pages), was occupied with a positively cyclopædic treatment of the Gospel story. The contemporary history was ransacked for the smallest items of the social, political, and religious condition of Israel; and a complete panorama was constructed of the scene in which Jesus moved. Each successive stage in the great drama was described in view of all that had been

[1] *Engl. Transl.* i. pp. 115, 148.

said about it before. The elaborate collections both of opinion and fact here brought together constitute a permanent store of information. But in a narrative swollen by such multitudinous aggregates the unity of the theme is obscured, and the central personality is often shrouded from view. The presence of mythic elements is freely conceded in representations such as those of the Birth, the Temptation, the Transfiguration, or the Ascension: but these do not touch the real significance of Jesus as 'the herald of a new religion and the representative and expression of pious humanity.' In spite of frank recognition of limitations, both intellectual and moral ('he was choleric by nature and race,' vol. vi. p. 416), Keim can still declare that 'with reference to religion Jesus remains to us the highest we know and are able to conceive' (*ibid.* p. 426).

V.

The condition of theology in England had not been favourable to the studies with which the German schools had so long been occupied. Modern historians have not failed to describe the deadening influences of the later Evangelicalism, out of which the Anglican Church was lifted by the great revival under Keble, Newman, and Pusey. No one was found to follow the investigations opened by Marsh, or to carry further the studies introduced from Berlin by Thirlwall. Coleridge's gifts did not lie in that direction. The Hares might translate Niebuhr, but

his methods must not be transferred from Rome to Palestine. Cambridge was largely under the spell of Simeon's influence, while Oxford was busy with the Fathers. Both of the great Church parties had a terror of 'neology'; the friends of Newman reeled under the shock of his secession; and Jowett was immediately suspected because he knew German and studied Baur.[1] Under these circumstances it is not a little remarkable that an English merchant should have produced quite independently a work which reached conclusions resembling those of Tübingen, so that their similarity excited both sympathy and surprise.

Charles Christian Hennell had been brought up in the older Unitarianism of Priestley and Belsham.[2] This school of Scriptural rationalism laid great stress on the miracles in proof of the Messianic character of Jesus,[3] which was in its turn regarded as essential to guarantee the truth of Revelation. The marriage of Hennell's sister Caroline to Mr. Charles Bray, a ribbon manufacturer near Coventry, brought him into a new intellectual atmosphere, in which Mr. Bray's robuster rationalism so far affected his brother-in-law that he undertook a special study of the Gospel narratives. His conclusions were published in 1838, under the title of an *Inquiry concerning the Origin*

[1] Save for the article already quoted from the *Westminster*, no reference to Strauss can be traced through the periodical literature of the forties.

[2] He was a nephew of the Rev. Edward Higginson of Derby.

[3] Hennell, however, justified his repudiation of the miracles by his teachers' example in rejecting the stories of the Virgin-birth. See Lect. VIII.

of Christianity. He possessed none of the learning of the schools; but his method and results were sufficiently noteworthy to secure the book a prompt translation into German.[1] Writing in 1839, Strauss who had seen a copy of the book in the hands of an English friend, commended it to his countrymen in these words:

'These excellent views which the learned German of our time appropriates to himself as the fruit of the religious development of his nation, this Englishman to whom the greater part of our means was wanting, has been able to evolve by his own efforts.'

Hennell had begun his investigations, and carried them a considerable way, with the expectation that at least the principal miraculous facts supposed to lie at the foundation of Christianity would be found to be impregnable. He soon realised the necessity of an adequate examination of the records, the object of which was thus defined (Preface):

'The analysis of the four Gospels, proceeding on the admission that they may contain a mixture of truth and error, is a very complicated but not impracticable task. It is necessary to form an opinion as to the date of each writing, the general character of each author, and his peculiarities as a writer; to institute continual comparisons between the events or discourses which he relates and the opinions and controversies which arose subsequently to his own time; to weigh the probability in favour of the real occurrence of a fact, considered in reference to the ascertained history of the time, with that in favour of its invention by the author or some intermediate narrator; to consider what greater degree of weight is due to the testimony from the accordance of all, or of several of the writers; and to ascertain whether they

[1] It was also published afterwards in Italian, and duly placed on the Index Expurgatorius.

wrote independently or copied from each other. By this laborious method of sifting and examining, it must be admitted that it would be possible to obtain a tolerably correct history from a collection of records acknowledged to be of a very mixed character.'

It is apparent at once how much more justly the author conceived his problem than the Deists of a century before. The outcome was remarkable. The Fourth Gospel was marked off clearly from the other Three, and though its apostolic character was admitted on the ground of testimony, its ideal presentation of Jesus was fully recognised on the ground of history. With respect to the Synoptics, they, too, had received many stories into their narratives which could not be accepted as fact. But enough remained after a careful analysis of miracle and prophecy to reveal Jesus in the character of enthusiast, revolutionist, reformer, and moral and religious teacher, whose doctrine was firmly planted on four great principles: (1) the spirit of devotion, by which the will of God is made the basis of all duty; (2) the doctrine of a future state before which the primitive preaching of the kingdom in the cruder sense of the restoration and enlargement of the throne of Israel fell away; (3) the enforcement of the virtues of humility and resignation; (4) unlimited benevolence enjoining love to all mankind. Moreover, the sufferings of Jesus justly enlisted sympathy on his behalf; he was more powerful on the cross than he would have been upon the throne. The Empire of Christianity, considered simply as the influence of the life, character, and doctrine of Christ over the human mind, will never cease.

'To awaken men to the perception of moral beauty is the first step towards enabling them to attain it.[1] But the contemplation of abstract qualities is difficult; some real or fictitious form is involuntarily sought as a substratum for the excellence which the moralist holds to view. Whilst no human character in the world can be brought to mind, which, in proportion as it could be closely examined, did not present some defects disqualifying it for being the emblem of moral perfection, we can rest with least check, or sense of incongruity, on the imperfectly known character of Jesus of Nazareth. If a representative be sought of human virtue, enough is still seen of his benevolent doctrine, attractive character, and elevated designs, to direct our eyes to the Prophet and Martyr of Galilee.'[2]

Amid the strife of ecclesiastical parties the calm enquiries of Hennell were but little heeded; and the voice of Strauss, when he was enabled to speak in English through Miss Evans, only served to warn instead of to attract. The truth was that English thought was not yet ripe for a Christianity without miracle, for it had then no philosophy, whether of religious belief or religious experience, on which to rest. The *Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion* (1843) by the brave New England prophet, Theodore Parker, found few readers in

[1] This position is in fact analogous to that of *Ecce Homo* described below.

[2] *Inquiry*, 2nd ed. p. 451. A full account of this book contributed by George Eliot to the Analytical Catalogue of Mr. Chapman's publications, issued in 1852, will be found in her *Life*, vol. i. pp. 94-102; she was led to study it through her intimacy with Mrs. Bray, Mr. Hennell's sister, and it exercised a marked influence upon her. In 1843 Miss Evans joined the Brays, Mr. Hennell, and his unmarried sister Sara, on a little tour into South Wales. Miss Brabant (daughter of Dr. Brabant, of Devizes) was also of the party. She had been entrusted by Mr. Joseph Parkes, of Birmingham, and a group of friends, with the translation of Strauss's *Leben Jesu*. Miss Brabant became engaged to Mr. Hennell, and shortly after her marriage she handed the work over to Miss Evans (*George Eliot's Life*, vol. i. p. 118).

this country, for it was conceived in an atmosphere of transcendentalism which the ordinary British mind could with difficulty breathe; and a whole generation was needed to acclimatise it in our midst. Francis William Newman told with unflinching courage the story of his *Phases of Faith*, and delineated in *The Soul, its Sorrows and Aspirations,* the realities of the purest religious life. But these poignant cries of a solitary spirit won little sympathy; the voice crying in the wilderness evoked hardly a disciple. High Churchmen were engaged with their own internal affairs,—the growth of ritualism, the Gorham controversy; even politicians yielded to the 'No Popery' cry; and Evangelical theology was chiefly concerned to defend the doctrine of the Atonement, the coarser forms of which were assailed with penetrating criticisms from the moral side. Meanwhile the entrenchments of science were advancing slowly against the citadel of Biblical infallibility. The outbreaks of anger against the *Origin of Species* on the one hand, and *Essays and Reviews* on the other, were symptoms of the disquiet within. The analysis of the Pentateuch, inaugurated by Dr. Colenso, began to suggest danger to the Gospels; when attention was suddenly arrested by a volume in which the writer sought to determine afresh for himself the real nature and object of Jesus. Its vigour of conception, its depth of feeling, its keen ethical analysis, its refreshing independence of ecclesiastical associations, its mastery of language and charm of style, awakened immediate interest, and lifted it at

once into the front rank of English treatises on the origin of Christianity. This book was *Ecce Homo: a Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ* (1866).[1]

The author's method, and his results, were alike unexpected. It was apparent at once that he wrote with the hand of a master; yet here was no technical apparatus of New Testament scholarship. He made no attempt to ascertain the sources or the characteristics of the Gospels. He assumed the miracles, as though they required no apology. He offered no delineation of the conditions of thought or life in which Jesus had grown up. Here was no Jewish lore, no estimate of Christ's relation to the institutions and parties of his age; above all, no treatment of the problem of eschatology, nor any examination of differences between the first Three Gospels and the Fourth.[2] The indispensable preparation for the study of the acts and words of Jesus as we now conceive it, was entirely absent. To the speculative, the literary, the historical questions, which Strauss and Baur in Germany, and Renan in France, had forced to the front, there was not an allusion. This made the appeal to the English reader all the simpler. He was not expected to know anything more than his Gospels. If he was also

[1] Published at first anonymously, it was afterwards acknowledged as the work of Prof. J. R. Seeley, then professor of Latin in University College, London.

[2] The preface to the fifth edition contained a short reply to his critics on these matters.

acquainted with Sophocles, Plato, and Shakespeare, as delineators of human nature, so much the better. The point of view from which the enquiry proceeded was thus defined (Preface):

'Those who feel dissatisfied with the current conceptions of Christ, if they cannot rest content without a definite opinion, may find it necessary to do what to persons not so dissatisfied it seems audacious and perilous to do. They may be obliged to reconsider the whole subject from the beginning, and placing themselves in imagination at the time when he whom we call Christ bore no such name, but was simply, as St. Luke describes him, a young man of promise, popular with those who knew him, and appearing to enjoy the Divine favour, to trace his biography from point to point, and accept those conclusions about him, not which church doctors or even apostles have sealed with their authority, but which the facts themselves, critically weighed, appear to warrant.'

The issue of such an attempt is here exhibited. The writer presents Jesus as endeavouring to found in the character of Messiah a new Society—it is not identified with the Church—for the improvement of human morality, to which he gave the name of the 'kingdom of God.' If it was asked how such a society differed from other societies having similar ends, like those which had gathered round Socrates, or his successors in the Academy, the Porch, and the Garden, the answer was not hard to find. Christianity was not a Philosophy; nor were its adherents formed into a community regulated by a law, like the Jews. Philosophy undertakes to explain what it is right to do; Christianity aims at making men disposed to do it; and the power which it employed for the creation of the needful dispositions

was the force of example embodied in Jesus himself. There are, therefore, two elements in the teaching of Christ; there is the content of his moral legislation enjoined on the members of the Society; and there is the impelling force generated by the contemplation of his character. To the exposition of this legislation, in the form of the laws of philanthropy, edification, mercy, resentment, forgiveness, the greater part of the book was devoted. The energy in which the believer would find the moral power for working out such laws in his personal conduct, was an energy of affection. The author called it the 'enthusiasm of humanity,' a passion of love for the race, or for the ideal of man, in each individual. Where this was kindled with sufficient warmth, it revealed at once what the Christian ought to do or feel, and gave him the strength needful for its achievement. The means for generating this passion lay in the contemplation of excellence lofty enough to make the meanest of mankind sacred with reflected glory. In moving language the writer delineated the manner in which Jesus himself supplied this type. The most hopeful and redeeming fact in history was the love which the Son of Man had borne to the lowest among men.

The significance of Christianity was thus transferred from the sphere of doctrine to that of affection. It appealed to humanity, but the nature thus summoned into the field was not fallen, ruined, abject; it was capable of immediate response of nobleness. To the fervent Evangelical a Christianity without an

atoning death was full of peril; and on the 12th of May, 1866, the veteran philanthropist, Lord Shaftesbury, made this entry in his diary:[1]

'Speaking at a meeting of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, I denounced *Ecce Homo* as a "most pestilential book." This expression I well recollect. The report adds "ever vomited from the jaws of hell." No doubt, then, I used the words. They have excited a good deal of wrath. Be it so. They were perhaps too strong for the world, but not too strong for the truth. It escaped in the heat of declamation, justifiable and yet injudicious.'

Very different was the estimate of another statesman who criticised the book from an opposite theological school. Writing in *Good Words*, February 1868, Mr. Gladstone thus described the author's method:

'He thrusts aside with a hand certainly not too reverent, perhaps even somewhat brisk and rough, all intermediate testimony of any kind. He invites his reader to consider for the moment all Christian tradition, all Christian institutions, all the long and diversified experience of faith in the world, as non-existent; to ascend with him the stream of time for more than eighteen hundred years; and to go direct into the presence of Christ, not such as he now presents himself, bearing in his hand the long roll of his conquests, but such as beside the Sea of Galilee, or in the synagogue of Capernaum, or the temple of Jerusalem, he then offered himself, to the ordinary Jew, with no other arms but those of his commission and his character, and the character of his acts and words. . . . . And what is the result? I appeal for answer to the book. I appeal to a vitality, an earnestness, an eloquence, a power, all of them derived from the deep and overflowing life of the wondrous figure which it contemplates and sets forth.'

So men who were weary of theological dogma,

[1] *Life*, vol. iii. p. 164.

and impatient of ecclesiastical strife, coming to this book, won refreshment and peace. The doubter did not find himself repelled or condemned; the believer discerned new grounds for faith. They passed into an ampler air, a larger fellowship; for the author, turning away from definitions which divide, appealed to the affections which unite; he simply condensed Christianity into the life and spirit of Christ.

LECTURE VI.

THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS

PART I.: THE LITERARY INVESTIGATION.

THE modern study of Christianity owes much to different kinds of intellectual stimulus. Many are the elements which enter now into a historic view, and the factors which unite to guide our judgments are too various to be traced back to any single mind. But it is probably true to say that on the critical side no two writers of the last century exerted so great an influence as Strauss and Baur. Whether by what was true in the positions which they were led to adopt, or by what was one-sided, exaggerated, and erroneous, they compelled attention, they stimulated thought, they inspired an enthusiasm for enquiry, they restated old problems in new forms, and gave a fresh direction to research. Writing in 1875, the late Principal Tulloch stated the general issue of the Tübingen criticism in the following terms[1]:

'No student since Baur can fail to recognise the distinctive

[1] *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Ferdinand Christian Baur.'

influences of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and the extent to which this distinction, and in some cases antagonism, are impressed upon the New Testament writings. To him also and his school must be attributed the modern idea that the surest foothold of Christianity is in the four great Pauline epistles. These, more than any other New Testament writings, lie in the clear dawn of the sun-rise which enlightened the world. The Gospels remain, not indeed in a mist of unauthentic story, but in comparative shadow. They come only gradually into the light after a long dim undergrowth in the rich soil of Primitive Christianity. There is much to be said against Baur's views of their later origin in the second century. The more this century is studied, the less does it seem capable of originating such marvellously fresh products of spiritual intelligence. But it is not the less certain that the Synoptic Gospels took their present form only by degrees, and that while they have their root in the Apostolic age and the Apostolic mind, they are also fashioned by later influences, and adapted to special wants in the Early Church. They are the deposits, in short, of Christian tradition, handed down first of all, and probably for a considerable period, in an oral form, before being committed to writing in such a form as we now have them. This, which is now an accepted conclusion with every historical school of theologians in England, no less than in Germany, conservative no less than radical, is largely the result of the Tübingen investigations.'

It has been already indicated that even in Baur's own life-time there was a movement away from his ideas of the relation of the Synoptic Gospels. The criticism of Baur was essentially historical. The tests which he applied to his documents were based less upon literary structure than on their place in a large scheme of the evolution of Christianity during the first century and a half after Jesus had passed away. He compared them with each other, and attempted to determine the causes of their differences, and the influences which had shaped

them into their present form. But his instruments of enquiry were less delicate than those now available; and half a century of labour since his famous essays on the Canonical Gospels appeared, has largely altered our point of view. To sketch that change, so far as the First Three Gospels are concerned, is the object of the present lecture. Much must be inevitably omitted; but I shall endeavour to place before you the two-fold nature of the problem: (1) What are the literary relations of the Gospels, how far can we present to ourselves any definite ideas of their sources and the manner of their compilation; and (2) What are their values compared with each other, and how far is it possible through their mutual divergences to reach the ultimate facts? Many minds have been at work on these questions during the last fifty years. It is reasonable to believe that their toil has not been fruitless. The questions which the student desires to solve are at least conceived more accurately; and he has a wider range of materials available for his investigation.

I.

The Tübingen criticism made its way into this country with great difficulty. The Oxford and Cambridge theologians who had been busy with St Paul, left the Gospels alone. Stanley, from his Professor's chair, discoursed serenely of the Jewish Church or of the Greek; but did not venture into the thorny paths

of the origin of Christianity.[1] Renan's 'Galilean romance' was of course used to point the moral of the dangerous investigations of Dr. Colenso.[2] The author of *Ecce Homo* avoided all critical enquiries, but showed considerable reserve about the Gospel of St. John. While the Anglican Church was busy with its own ecclesiastical difficulties, two Nonconformist scholars were meditating the new methods, and first ventured to publish the results of study along the Tübingen lines. Of the *Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel,* by the Rev. John James Tayler (1867), some account must be given in the next Lecture. In the following year, Dr. Samuel Davidson, who had previously maintained the traditional view of all the Canonical books, produced a wholly fresh *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. The Tübingen thesis that Mark had employed Matthew and Luke was here presented to the English reader. Baur's date for *Matt.* 24 was rejected on the ground that 'this generation' in ^{34} could not be stretched to mean a century; but passages like 16^{19}, 18^{17}, and 24^{14}, prevented the critic from putting the first canonical gospel before 100 A.D.[3]. *Luke* followed about 115, and *Mark* was consequently carried down to 120. The Synoptic Gospels were

[1] Yet, later in life, he certainly purposed to follow the example of Ewald, and add a Life of Christ to the series on the Jewish Church.

[2] Readers may still like to be directed to the fine criticism upon it by Dr. Martineau, in the *National Review*, 1863, reprinted in *Essays, Reviews, and Addresses*, vol. iii. pp. 282-335.

[3] In the 2nd ed., 1882, this was more definitely fixed at 105, and *Luke* at 110.

thus safely lodged in the second century. There the author of *Supernatural Religion* left them in 1874. The rapid awakening of English interest in the Gospel problems since the appearance of *Ecce Homo* eight years before, may be partly measured by the effect of this famous book. Its object was to enquire into the character of Christianity considered as a supernatural revelation of truths otherwise beyond discovery by the human mind. Such a revelation must rest upon miracle; and two questions then immediately arose: (1) What place is there for miracles in the order of nature? and (2) Is the testimony of the Christian records adequate to establish a miraculous origin for Christianity? The answer to the second of these enquiries alone concerns us here. It is well known that the Four Gospels are not mentioned by name till the latter part of the second century. What evidence can be found of their existence at an earlier date? The author of *Supernatural Religion* passed the whole of the available literature under review up to that period, discussing allusions and parallels and quotations from the apostolic memoirs, with the object of discovering their sources. Every student is aware of the frequent looseness of citation, the inexactness of reproduction from remembrance, the confusion of language and the amalgamation of phrases from different books, which mark the writings of the post-Apostolic age. As will be seen hereafter, scholars of the highest eminence can still take different views of the same facts. Unhappily the author of *Supernatural Religion* could not be acquitted of partizan-

ship in his attacks on Dr. Westcott, or of occasional lapses of scholarship which created a general suspicion of his work.[1] Broadly speaking, its issue was summed up in the statement that no single distinct trace of any of the Synoptic Gospels with the exception of the Third, could be discovered during the first century and a half after the death of Jesus:[2] *Luke* had been used by Marcion, and must have been in existence before 140 A.D. On what materials *Luke* was based, and whether it pre-supposed either of the other Gospels, the author did not enquire. No attempt was made to envisage the whole question in the light of the general Christian tradition. The conclusion was inevitable; the late dates of the records and the uncertain character of their authorship rendered them incapable of supporting the immense superstructure of a miraculous and supernatural revelation.

So vigorous a challenge however, could not remain unanswered. It was, in fact, continued, though in a characteristically different fashion, by Matthew Arnold, who popularised some of the ideas of Tübingen in the very act of pouring light mockery over the 'vigour and rigour' of their original exponents.[3] But in the meantime Anglican learning

[1] In successive editions many improvements were made and blemishes removed.

[2] Part II., chap. x., 'Results'; popular ed., 1902, p. 433. In this edition fresh material arising out of recent discoveries has been incorporated. The authorship has now been acknowledged by Mr. Walter R. Cassells.

[3] This aim already lies at the back of *Literature and Dogma*, 1873; and came clearly to view in *God and the Bible*, 1875.

was preparing to step into the field. The Rev. W. Sanday, then at Durham, who had already produced an Essay on the Gospel of John,[1] undertook an elaborate examination into the nature of the 'Memoirs of the Apostles' so constantly cited by Justin the Martyr in the middle of the second century. Dr. Lightfoot poured out his vast learning in reply to the criticisms of *Supernatural Religion* on Dr. Westcott in the pages of the *Contemporary Review,* hoping to cover the whole ground of the testimony of the Church to the New Testament Scriptures during the first two centuries. The design was never completed, but the *Essays on Supernatural Religion* published in their collected form in 1889, and the *Biblical Essays* (issued in 1893), gave a powerful impulse to English study of early Christian literature, and served as a basis for future investigation. But they did not touch the essential problem. The Gospels themselves, what, after all, were they?

II.

It will be remembered that in the early days of the shock first caused by Strauss in 1835, attention had been directed to the inadequacy of his literary treatment of the Gospels, and, three years later, two scholars, Weisse and Wilke, had simultaneously pleaded the cause of Mark as the earliest of the Gospels. Ewald had advocated the same view; and it had even planted itself among the young scholars

[1] *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel,* 1872.

captivated by Tübingen.[1] It did not succeed, however, in establishing itself firmly in the critical schools till the years 1863-4, when a securer basis was found for it by the labours of Heinrich Holtzmann, of Strasburg, and Carl Weizsäcker, of Tübingen. Independently of their work, Dr. Daniel Schenkel, of Heidelberg, addressed himself to the task of allaying the excitement in Germany caused by Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, by a 'truly human, really historical representation.' The book was written with enthusiasm. The French volume had been published in June, 1863; by the fourth week in Advent the same year Schenkel was ready with his *Characterbild Jesu*.[2] With the opposition which it evoked among German theologians, we are not concerned. Schenkel said himself that it was the first time that the subject was approached from the point of view of the second Gospel. In *Mark*, which he traced back to a pre-canonical original about 60 A.D., was the earliest portraiture of Jesus, and the clearest witness to the growth of his Messianic consciousness. This fact alone sufficed to show the unhistorical character of the representation of the fourth Gospel, where Peter addressed him at their very first meeting as Messiah and Nathanael proclaimed him King of the Jews. Schenkel, however, was well aware that the Johannine teaching is much more in harmony with the forms of contemporary German religion, and he did

[1] Albert Ritschl contended for it in 1851.

[2] Published in English under the title *A Sketch of the Character of Jesus*, 1869.

not hesitate to accept the translation of the Synoptic ideas by the later Evangelist as a better representation of the essential thought of Jesus.[1] His 'Sketch,' therefore, was not really faithful to the point of view from which it professed to start; the figure which emerged bore too much resemblance to a modern religious idealist.

In the meantime, Holtzmann's treatise[2] was opening new paths. Discarding the Tübingen method of fixing the place of a document by its supposed affinities with the Jewish or the Gentile party, he addressed himself to a careful investigation of the language of the Synoptics, the order of their narratives, and the inferences which the literary facts suggested. The result was that a narrative resembling our *Mark* had been employed by Matthew and Luke, but in a fuller form than our present Canonical Gospel; while a second source for *Matthew* and *Luke* was found in the collection of the 'Logia' ascribed by Papias to the Apostle Matthew, the Lucan form of certain sayings being the more probable. The conclusion of Weizsäcker's investigations pointed in the same direction.[3] By a comparative analysis of the First Three Gospels he sought to determine the nature of the materials that lay behind them. These were carried back to two sources: (1) a primitive written document, resting on earlier

[1] See, for instance, chap. xxiii., 'The Future of the Kingdom of God.' This subject is discussed below, Lect. VII.

[2] *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863.

[3] *Untersuchungen über die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1864; 2nd ed., 1901.

groups of traditional material, whose author was neither an apostle, nor (like Papias's Mark) a simple recorder of apostolic reminiscences,—now embodied in our *Mark*; and (2) the Logia-collection further employed by Matthew and Luke, *Matthew* on the whole deserving the preference. The fourth Gospel was ascribed in substance to the Apostle, in actual record to a disciple's hand.

The Two-Document hypothesis was now fairly started. The priority of *Mark* won clearer and clearer recognition. In Holland it secured the support of Dr. Scholten, of Leiden (1868); at Berlin, Dr. Bernard Weiss began the yet unfinished series of his gospel studies with an essay on Mark as the earliest of the Canonical Three (1872); the veteran Edouard Reuss had long given it this position in his teaching at Strasburg, and made it the foundation of the 'Histoire Évangélique' in his great *Bible* (1876); Renan expounded it with easy grace in *Les Évangiles* (1877); and in this country Dr. Abbot securely established it in his article on the 'Gospels' in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1879). The ancient theory of an 'epitomator' was shattered by the literary examination of the parallel versions of the story of the vineyard and the husbandmen in *Mark* $12^{1\text{-}11}$, *Matt.* $21^{33\text{-}44}$, *Luke* $20^{9\text{-}18}$. The comparison of these several recitals showed that Mark's form contained all the words (with the exception of four quite unimportant) found in both the other two. To produce this result by compilation, the Second Evangelist must have placed the First and Third

Gospels side by side, underlined their common contents, and then proceeded to write a fresh narrative which should embody them. No story with the individual touches which frequently distinguish Mark's style, could have been produced in such mechanical fashion. The hypothesis that *Mark* was only an abstract of *Matthew* and *Luke* has never been revived.

III.

There remains, then, no weapon for the student but that of analysis. The Gospels, as Prof. Sanday has said, grew up in the dark: and their history can only be recovered in the form of a series of conjectures to account for the facts which they exhibit. Before, however, proceeding very briefly to indicate the nature of some of these facts, it may be worth while once more to rehearse the two items of information which descend to us through the historian Eusebius from Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, whom Lightfoot supposed to have written between the years 130 and 140 A.D. or even later. The first quotation is thus rendered by Westcott:

'This also the Elder[1] used to say: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he [Mark] remembered (or all that he [Peter] mentioned[2]), though he did not record in order that which was either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord, nor followed him, but subse-

[1] Apparently the Elder John mentioned just before (Lightfoot).

[2] Lightfoot does not offer an alternative, either here or below.

quently attached himself to Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the wants [of his hearers], but not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses. So Mark committed no error, as he wrote down some particulars just as he recalled them to mind (or as he [Peter] narrated them). For he took heed to one thing, to omit none of the facts that he heard, and to make no false statement in his account of them.'

After this notice Eusebius continues:

'But concerning Matthew the following statement is made: So then Matthew composed the Oracles in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he could.'[1]

Whether or not our Gospels are the same as those actually known to Papias is uncertain. Lightfoot argued earnestly that they were; Prof. Sanday, with a clearer view of the passage of the Evangelic narratives through several stages of completeness, is quite willing to concede the possibility that they were not.[2] But if they were, it is now generally admitted that Papias's account of them cannot be reconciled with their actual condition. *Mark*, it is plain, is something more than a series of detached reminiscences. It has its little chains of anecdotes, like the series of incidents following the first synagogue-preaching in Capernaum, which may well have planted themselves in Peter's memory; or the group of stories illustrating the attitude of Jesus to the Sabbath. But Papias declares expressly that Mark did not make a 'connected narrative' of the Lord's discourses. Yet Mark's narrative is exceedingly well 'connected': it has not only an

[1] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39.

[2] Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd ed., vol. II., pt. i., p. 1222.

introduction and a final catastrophe, but it has also a conspicuous crisis in the middle, the recognition of Jesus as Messiah at Caesarea Philippi, and his announcement that he would make the great venture and go to Jerusalem. The way for the final tragedy is carefully prepared. Moreover, no one can suppose that such a discourse as that preserved in *Mark* 13 was really derived straight from Peter's recollection. The strange phrase in [14] 'let him that readeth understand,' with its counterpart in *Matt.* 24[15], points clearly to a written source behind the two versions of the prophecy. It is agreed, therefore, that our *Mark* (to use the words of Prof. Salmon[1]) 'contains a great deal more than the Petrine tradition.' Was that supplemental matter added by Mark himself? The analogies to be named hereafter suggest that it need not have been Peter's companion who (again to quote Prof. Salmon) 'chose to complete it into a Gospel.'

The argument in the case of *Matthew* is no less clear. The linguistic resemblances which it displays to the other Gospels leave hardly a doubt in the mind of any student that this Gospel is not a translation; it was written originally in Greek.[2] The proof of this cannot be exhibited here; though the English parallels with *Luke* cited below will partly suggest its nature. But, further, the First Gospel, while it undoubtedly contains important

[1] *Historical Introd. to the Books of the N.T.*, 3rd ed., 1888, p. 157.

[2] Some qualification is necessary when so learned an apologist as Zahn still defends the translation theory.

groups of sayings which may well have belonged to the original Matthæan collection, presents them in combination with a narrative which bears numerous marks of elaborate arrangement. It is evident, therefore, that our *Matthew* is at least removed by two stages from an apostolic book of *logia* in the Palestinian vernacular. In the first stage these *logia* had to be rendered into Greek; in the second stage they had to be organised into a Gospel. The first part of the process can no longer be traced. Is it possible to obtain any light upon the second? The answer comes from a comparison of *Mark* with each of the other two.

This comparison reveals many interesting facts. In the first place a number of passages are at once disclosed which relate incidents or sayings common to all three Gospels, often reported in nearly the same words. Such are the narratives of the Baptism, the feeding of the multitude, the last supper, the parable of the sower and the discourse on the Mount of Olives. In other passages two Gospels may agree against the third. Thus *Matthew* and *Luke* concur in important sections such as the two versions of the great Sermon, or the reply to the message of John the Baptist, which *Mark* does not contain. Similar concurrence is observable between *Matthew* and *Mark* occasionally, as in the second feeding miracle which Luke omits, or the withering of the fig-tree under Jesus' curse. *Mark* and *Luke* have also some traits in common, both reporting the incident of the poor widow who cast her

two mites into the Treasury. Lastly, each Gospel has some elements peculiar to itself. The amount in *Mark* with no parallel in either of the others has been variously estimated at from 24 to 30 verses. In *Matthew* the proportion is much larger, and in *Luke* it is greater still. But this third group may be for the present ignored. The enquiry into the mutual relations of the Gospels must be based on the first and second; and of these the series of passages represented in all three naturally claims prior consideration. Two classes of resemblance are here of importance: (1) resemblances of language in any given passage; and (2) resemblances in the order of the series of passages. The first are the easier to observe; the second are the more significant for the general argument.

Consider for instance the story of the cleansing of the leper in the following parallels:

Matt. 8^{2-4}.	*Mark* 1^{40-44}.	*Luke* 5^{12-14}.
And behold, there came to him a *leper*, and worshipped *him*, *saying*, Lord, *if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And he stretched forth his hand and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean.*	And there cometh to him a *leper*, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, *and saying* unto *him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And* being moved with compassion *he stretched forth his hand, and touched him*, and *saith* unto him, *I will; be thou made clean. And*	And . . . behold, a man full of *leprosy*, and when he saw Jesus, he fell on his face and besought *him saying*, Lord, *if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean.*

And straightway his leprosy was made clean.	*straightway the leprosy* departed from *him*, and he was made clean. *And* he strictly charged him and straightway sent him out, *And*	*And straightway the leprosy* departed from *him*. *And* he charged
And Jesus saith *unto him*, See thou *tell no man, but* go thy way, *shew thyself to the priest, and offer* the gift which *Moses commanded for a testimony unto them.*	saith *unto him*, See thou *say* nothing *to any man; but* go thy way, *shew thyself to the priest, and offer* for thy cleansing the things which *Moses commanded for a testimony unto them.*	*him* to *tell no man, but* go thy way, and *shew thyself to the priest, and offer* for thy cleansing according as *Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.*

It is evident at once that there is a very close connexion between these three stories. In respect of *Matthew,* it may be said at once that the close agreement of its language with corresponding phrases in *Mark* and *Luke* renders it impossible to suppose that it is an independent translation from an original record in a Palestinian vernacular.[1] Nor is it likely that a common tradition, formed originally in the native language of

[1] The chances of continuous agreement in such cases are exceedingly small. In the following parallels from the Authorised Version the identical words in the original Greek are italicised: but King James's translators did not think it necessary to make them agree in English.

Mark 12^{38-39}.	*Luke* 20^{46}.
Beware *of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing and* [love] *salutations in the market-places and the chief seats in the synagogues and the uppermost rooms at feasts.*	Beware *of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and* love *greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues and the chief rooms at feasts.*

Galilee, would have been reproduced with such close conformities in Greek. The probability is therefore in favour of the dependence of each of two upon the third. But which is the original? At first sight there seem no decisive marks. The variations are small, and present little clue. But *Mark* contains one significant statement, 'and straightway the leprosy departed from him, and [he] was made clean.' The pronoun 'he' is not expressed, but may be inferred from the preceding words, 'be thou made clean.' In *Luke* the second verb is wanting: in *Matthew* the first,—with this result:

Matt.	*Luke.*
And straightway the leprosy was made clean.	And straightway the leprosy departed from him.

Which is the more natural, that *Matthew* and *Luke* each dropped a word out of the seemingly redundant narrative of *Mark*, or that *Mark* combined the phrases of the other two? The frequent occurrence of other doublets in *Mark* suggests that this is a picturesque characteristic of his style: and the phrase 'the leprosy was made clean' seems less natural after the 'be thou made clean' than the form given to *Mark's* words by our translators. If so, *Matthew* and *Luke* are both here secondary to *Mark*.

This will become clearer in another instance from the same group of narratives. The effect of the first synagogue-preaching in Capernaum is thus described:

Mark 1^{21-22}.

And they go *into Capernaum*, and straightway on *the Sabbath day* he entered into the synagogue and taught. *And they were astonished at his teaching*, for he taught them as having *authority*, and not as the scribes.

Luke 4^{31-32}.

And he came down *into Capernaum*, a city of Galilee. And he was teaching them on *the Sabbath day*; *and they were astonished at his teaching*; for his word was with *authority*.

The description of the opening of the ministry of Jesus in *Matthew* is quite different. Its early incidents as reported by Mark and Luke are all rearranged; the synagogue scene in Capernaum is dropped; and room is at once made for the great discourse familiar to us as the Sermon on the Mount. At its close, 7^{28-29}, occurs this statement:

And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these words, the multitudes *were astonished at his teaching*, *for he taught them as having authority*, *and not as* their *scribes*.

The italicised phrase corresponds exactly with *Mark's*:[1] but it has been transferred to another place in the story.

More significant, perhaps, than examples such as these, which may be traced all through the narrative from the Baptism to the Crucifixion, are the remarkable phenomena of the order in which the same incidents are recorded in the several Gospels. The details of these peculiarities are intricate:[2] for the two longer Gospels, *Matthew* and *Luke*, are marked by great divergences of arrange-

[1] With the exception of the curious detachment implied in the pronoun 'their' scribes.

[2] See *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii., 1890: 'The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels,' by the Rev. F. H. Woods.

ment, as well as by numerous additions to the matter common to all three Synoptics. Matthew appears to group together collections of sayings which Luke disperses through separate occasions (cp. *Matt.* 5-7, 10, 13); and the first half of our First Gospel thus presents alternate sections of teaching and narrative. This causes repeated dislocations of connexions clearly recognised by Mark and Luke. Thus the cure of Peter's wife's mother, related by by them in immediate sequence on the scene in the synagogue just quoted (*Mark* 1^{29-31}, *Luke* 4^{38-39}), is postponed by Matthew till 8^{14-15}. In *Matt.* 1-13, accordingly, the deviations from Mark's order are numerous. On the other hand *Luke* 9^{51}-18^{14}, as is well known, follows a highly independent course.[1] But *Mark* can be shown to present the common type from which the other two have departed, in dealing with the additional materials which they have incorporated. 'If,' says Mr. Woods, 'we divide St. Mark into three parts, *(a)* 1-3^{6}, *(b)* 3^{7}-6^{13}, *(c)* 6^{14}-16^{8}, the relative order of *(a)* agrees exactly with St. Luke [allowing for the latter's insertions]; that of *(b)* with either St. Matthew or St. Luke, and in parts with both; that of *(c)* agrees exactly with St. Matthew [from 14^{1} onwards], and for the most part with St. Luke.'[2] When the First and Third Gospels are

[1] See the papers of the Rev. Canon Sir John C. Hawkins in the *Expository Times*, 1902, on 'The Disuse of the Marcan Source in St. Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14'; especially December, p. 139.

[2] A comparative table of *Mark* 1^{14}-3^{35} and its parallels in *Matt.* will be found in the author's *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed., p. 344. Students will of course consult Mr. Woods' Essay, or the tables in Prof. Sanday's article 'Gospels' in Smith's *D.B.*[2], or in Holtzmann's *Einleitung in das N.T.*, or *Die Synoptiker*, 3rd ed., 1901.

thus compared with the Second, it appears that the easiest explanation of their incongruities is to be found in treating them as departures in different directions from an older sequence now preserved in *Mark*. If to this consideration we add the linguistic parallels of which examples have been already offered, the argument becomes still stronger. It has been reckoned that the total number of words in *Mark* is 11,158. Of these 2,651 are common to all three Gospels, 2,793 to *Mark* and *Matthew*; 1,174 to *Mark* and *Luke*. 'Thus more than half of the whole substance of St. Mark has been absorbed into the other Gospels.'[1]

This conclusion is further reinforced by the occurrence of instances in which *Matthew* presents incidents or sayings belonging to both narratives in forms that are distinctly secondary.[2] When Jesus visits Nazareth, *Mark* reports, 6^4:

> And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them.

But *Matthew* softens this inability into a statement which explains the limitation of his healing power by the want of faith of his fellow-townsmen, 13^{58}:

> And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.

It is less surprising that the people of Nazareth should not have showed faith in their visitor, when

[1] Sanday, quoting the figures of Dr. Schaff, Smith's *D.B.*[2], vol. II., pt. ii. p. 1224.

[2] For examples of addition by Matthew see *The First Three Gospels*,[2] pp. 348-350.

the family of Jesus, according to *Mark* $3^{20\text{-}21}$, actually proposed to place him under restraint because of his eccentric conduct.

> And he cometh into a house. And the multitude cometh together again so that they could not so much as eat bread. And when his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him; for they said, He is beside himself.

The sequel follows in $^{31\text{-}35}$, when his mother and brothers, standing outside the house, send in a message to summon him forth to them. His first reply seems a blank repudiation of the parental tie: 'Who is my mother and my brethren?' It is intelligible only when the key to the whole scene is supplied by *Mark*. But as the conception of the Master grew in majesty in the hearts of the disciples, so grievous a misinterpretation could be endured no more; the purpose of the family was suppressed; and Jesus was left exposed to the shaft of the modern critic who thought it harsh and unfilial that he should find a new home in the hearts of those who do the Father's will.

One further instance may be quoted because it exhibits a plain manipulation of a question and an answer dealing with one of the most simple problems of the time. Every one remembers the enquiry of the rich young man, reported in identical terms in *Mark* 10^{17} and *Luke* 18^{18}, 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?' And every one recalls the disclaimer of Jesus, 'Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, even God.' Matthew, however, shrinks from such an implied

confession. Accordingly he drops from the opening address the title 'good,' to attach it to the conduct to be prescribed, 19^{16}: 'Master, what good thing shall I do?' The counter-question of Jesus then appears in the form, 'Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?' But the continuation, 'One there is who is good,' shows that the reference after all was to persons not to things. It is in accordance with the reverence implied in such changes, that the First Gospel presents Jesus in the Messianic character from the outset. The heavenly utterance addressed to *him* at the Baptism, announcing his Messianic sonship, *Mark* 1^{11}, is converted in *Matt.* 3^{17} into a public proclamation attesting his dignity to the bystanders. From the Mount he issues a new legislation, designed to supersede the ancient Law, and already contemplates the 'day' when he will reject from entrance into the kingdom of heaven those that work iniquity. The disciples in the boat, when he has rescued Peter, and the wind has fallen, recognise his Messianic character, 14^{33}, though Peter's declaration of the title is afterwards expressly ascribed to revelation, 16^{17}; and in the final scene, 28^{18}, Jesus appears invested with 'all authority' in heaven and on earth, as a permanent spiritual presence abiding with the Church. On every ground, then, of language, order, and general contents, *Matthew* appears in its present form posterior to *Mark*.[1]

The relative positions of *Matthew* and *Luke* are

[1] Some counter phenomena are briefly discussed below.

more difficult to decide. A very brief examination of the Gospels at once discloses the fact that they contain numerous parallels not to be found in *Mark*. Thus each opens the history of Jesus with a story of his birth; each relates three temptations in the wilderness; each reports a Great Sermon, Matthew putting it on the Mount, and Luke upon the Plain; each recites a prayer to be used by the disciples and a parable of the Talents or Pounds. When these are set side by side, they are seen to be characterised by very marked variations in degree of resemblance. The birth-stories have no element in common save that the scene is laid in Bethlehem. The temptations are identical, though the order varies. The Sermons follow the same general course, but Luke's is much shorter (like his version of the Prayer), and the spirit of its opening is in marked contrast to that of its counterpart. The parables of the Talents and the Pounds are founded on somewhat different bases (the story might, of course, have been easily told twice in changing forms); but Luke has amalgamated his version with another story having an independent motive.[1] On the other hand, there are passages where the verbal correspondence is so close as at once to suggest that they are derived from a common source. Thus, the message of John the Baptist, and the reply of Jesus, are reported in almost identical terms; though the slight narrative settings show less close resemblance.

[1] See *The First Three Gospels*,[2] p. 309.

Matt. 11[2-11].

Now when John heard in the prison the works of the Christ, he *sent* by his disciples, and said unto him, *Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?*

And Jesus *answered and said unto them, Go your way, and tell John the things which ye* do *hear* and see; *the blind receive their sight,* and *the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear,* and *the dead are raised up,* and *the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me.*

And as these went their way, Jesus *began to say to the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? A reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft* [raiment]?
Behold they that wear soft [raiment]

Luke 7[18-28].

And the disciples of John told him of all these things. And John, calling unto him two of his disciples, *sent* them to the Lord, saying, *Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?* And when the men were come unto him, they said, John the Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?

In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits; and on many that were blind he bestowed sight.

And he *answered and said unto them, Go your way, and tell John the things which ye* have seen *and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me.*

And when the messengers of John were departed, he *began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft* raiment? *Behold they that* are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately,

are in king's houses? *But wherefore went ye out? To see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.*
This is he of whom it is written,
Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
Who shall prepare thy way before thee.
Verily *I say unto you, Among them that are born of women* there hath not arisen *a greater than John* the Baptist: *yet he that is but little in the kingdom* of heaven *is greater than he.*

are in kings' courts. *But what went ye out to see? A prophet?*[1] *Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.*
This is he of whom it is written,
Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
Who shall prepare thy way before thee.
I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there is none *greater than John; yet he that is but little in the kingdom* of God *is greater than he.*

The exact concord of many of the words of Jesus in these two passages, which even include the same misquotation from *Malachi* 3^1, points to a common source. But Luke, while reporting the language of Jesus in almost identical terms,[2] adds to the story the remarkable statement [21] of a number of illustrative cures. These are obviously designed to prepare the way for the language of the reply of Jesus to the Baptist, which Matthew appears—no doubt correctly, in view of the last clause about the poor, to have understood symbolically. In this case we may provisionally infer that Matthew and Luke have drawn their materials from some prior document, but

[1] The Greek of *Mt.* and *Lk.* is here the same, but the punctuation varies.

[2] There is a curious variation in the 'gorgeously apparelled,' etc., [25]; the parallels in the last verses, 'kingdom of heaven' and 'kingdom of God,' are severally characteristic of the two Gospels.

Luke has handled them more freely.[1] A second illustration will render this still clearer.

The description of the preaching of the Baptist in the First and Third Gospels is evidently founded on a common base; but it is enriched by Luke with counsels addressed to different classes of the people. Of these Matthew says no word; he directs the Baptist's warnings against the Pharisees and Sadducees alone.

Matt. 3^{7-12}.

But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his baptism, he said unto them, *Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance*: *and* think *not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father*: *for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe laid unto the root of the trees*: *every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.*

Luke 3^{7-17}.

He said therefore to the multitudes that went out to be baptised of him, *Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and* begin *not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father*: *for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe* also *laid unto the root of the trees. every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.*

And the multitudes asked him, saying, What then must we do? And he answered and said unto them, He that hath

[1] For brevity's sake, the possibility that Luke may have copied directly from Matthew is not here considered. Other phenomena to be named directly render this practically impossible.

two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise.

And there came also publicans to be baptised, and they said unto him, Master, what must we do? And he said unto them, Extort no more than that which is appointed you.

And soldiers also asked him, saying, And we, what must we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither exact *anything* wrongfully; and be content with your wages.

And as the people were in expectation, and all men reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the Christ; John answered saying to them all, *I indeed baptize you with water; but* there *cometh he that is mightier than I*, the latchet of *whose shoes I am not worthy* to unloose: *he shall baptize you with Holy Spirit and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, thoroughly* to *cleanse his threshing-floor, and* to *gather* the *wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.*

I, indeed, baptize you with water, unto repentance; *but he* that *cometh* after me *is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy* to bear: he shall *baptize you with Holy Spirit and with fire*: *whose fan is in his hand*, and he will *thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor*; *and* he will *gather his wheat into* the *garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.*

The whole of the Matthæan report of John's preaching is thus reproduced by Luke, but in combination with other material. The questions of the people

are altogether new: and the second part of the discourse in *Matthew* receives an explanatory preface in *Luke*. Further, slight differences in the midst of such close parallelism suggest that one Evangelist does not copy from the other; but that both are dependent on some antecedent source. Moreover, that source may possibly have existed in different editions, so that the saying about the shoes was current in dissimilar versions. Of this probability further illustrations may be found in the well-known cases of the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes. The Lucan form of the Lord's Prayer varies only by defect: but the Blessings of Matthew have absolutely no counterpart to the Woes of Luke.

Matt $5^{3\text{-}11}$.	*Luke* $6^{20\text{-}26}$.
Blessed are the *poor* in spirit: *for* theirs *is the kingdom* of heaven.	*Blessed are* ye *poor*; *for* yours *is the kingdom* of God.
Blessed are they that mourn: *for* they shall be comforted (or *consol*ed).	*Blessed are* ye *that hunger* now: *for* ye *shall be filled.*
Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.	*Blessed are* ye that weep now: *for* ye shall laugh.
Blessed are they *that hunger* and thirst after righteousness: *for* they *shall be filled.*	*Blessed are ye when* men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you [from their company], and *reproach you*, and cast out your name as *evil for* the Son of man's *sake. Rejoice* in that day, and leap [for joy]: *for* behold *your reward is great in heaven*: for in the same manner did their fathers unto the *prophets.*
Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.	
Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.	
Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God.	
Blessed are they that have been	

persecuted for righteousness sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are ye when men shall *reproach you*, and persecute you, and say all manner of *evil* against you falsely, *for* my *sake*. *Rejoice*, and be exceeding glad: *for great is your reward in heaven*: for so persecuted they *the prophets* which were before you.

But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your *consola*tion.

Woe unto you that are full now! for ye shall hunger.

Woe [unto you], ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.

Woe [unto you], when all men shall speak well of you! for in the same manner did their fathers unto *the prophets*.

Many things deserve notice here. Both groups stand in the same place at the beginning of the great Sermon. Matthew reports nine Blessings, while Luke throws the sayings into the antithetical form of four Blessings and four Woes. In contrast with Luke, the first eight Blessings of Matthew are cast in the third person, but the ninth passes into address in the second person. This last beatitude is nearly equivalent to Luke's fourth, as its sequel 'Rejoice' clearly proves (notice Matthew's direct 'for my sake,' while Luke has the impersonal 'Son of man'). But most significant of all is the open difference of spirit. In Luke it is the physically poor to whom the kingdom is promised; the hungry crowd that hangs upon the speaker's words is to be filled; and the rich and satisfied and laughing are dismissed to their doom. Matthew sounds quite another note. The inheritors of blessing are not present to be kindled with immediate hope. The announcements have the air of reflective generalisations from deep inner experience; and the impas-

sioned summons of the last Blessing, to rejoice in the midst of persecution, is the only one that bears within it the urgency of personal appeal. It is difficult to conceive that either author has actually reshaped or transmuted the other's words.[1] It seems more likely that the two sets of Blessings lay in some prior document, which circulated in the churches in what we should call different editions. To what document, however, can these groups of teaching, common to our Matthew and Luke, be traced? The answer of modern Gospel study is, the Matthæan *logia*.[2] Written, according to the tradition handed on by Papias, in the Palestinian vernacular, they were not always intelligible to Greek readers; 'everyone translated them as he could.' We may surmise, then, that different renderings of these 'sayings' (which seem to have included an account of John's preaching), passed into use in different localities.

[1] Wernle does, indeed, surmise that Luke himself added the four Woes, and probably materialised the 'hunger' as bodily by inserting 'now': *Synoptische Frage* (1899), p. 62. On the other hand, Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, 3rd ed., 1901, regards Matthew's 'in spirit,'[3], 'righteousness'[6], and 'for righteousness' sake'[8], as later defining additions, p. 202. Luke's double 'now' emphasizes the contrast between 'this age' and 'that age' or the 'age to come,' cp. $20^{34\,35}$, p. 340. Bruce, *Expositor's Greek Test.*, vol. i. p. 504, implies that Luke's language has been shaped under contemporary influences; 'the description corresponds to the state of the early Church'; 'Christ's words are adapted to present circumstances,' etc. Elsewhere, p. 96, the same writer suggests that Jesus might have expanded the same thought on different occasions with different comments. This suggestion seems hardly to recognise adequately the element of social revolution involved in the Lucan form, which is spiritually incongruous with the Matthæan.

[2] Sir John Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (1899), p. 89, reckons about 185 verses as common to both Gospels, 'i.e. rather more than one-sixth of the 1,068 verses of Matthew, and rather less than one-sixth of the 1,149 verses of Luke.'

In one community they would receive an immediate interpretation and be connected with the conception of social change, when existing conditions might be reversed: in another, they would be transferred from the sphere of outward circumstance to that of inward temper, and the blessing would descend on a disposition of the soul. In course of time, such documents would take up into themselves fresh traditions, and by degrees two versions of what was once the same original might come to vary considerably both in contents and spirit.

That such additions were from time to time made even to our Gospels, has been already remarked. A modern instance may help to render this process more easily conceivable. Travellers in Persia in the middle of the last century became acquainted with one of the most remarkable religious movements in the Mohammedan world, known in Europe as Bábism. Its founder, Ali Mohammed, the young seer of Shiraz, was executed in the year 1850, at the age of thirty. His father, who died early, had been a grocer; he himself received the ordinary education of a Mohammedan youth, and in 1842, after a visit to the holy shrines of Kerbelá,[1] betook himself to the lecture-room of a distinguished Mohammedan theologian, Hajji Seyyid Kázim. The teacher was full of a kind of Messianic hope, and was already announcing the advent of the promised Proof, and the signs of his appearance. 'I see him,' he would say, 'as the rising sun.' This hope Ali Mohammed

[1] In Asiatic Turkey, on the Euphrates.

believed was realised in himself. He took the title of Báb or 'Gate': disciples gathered round him; and in 1844 the new faith was formally proclaimed. It excited the bitter hostility of the clergy, who instigated the severest persecution of his followers. He himself was arrested and imprisoned in the castle of Maku close to the Persian frontier, and after three years' confinement was executed on July 9th, 1850. His widow survived till the year 1884; two successors, one transported to Famagusta in Cyprus, the other at Acre in Palestine, both lived on into the last decade of the century.[1] The 'goodly fellowship' of the Bábí martyrs includes men of all ranks and occupations; and the followers of the young teacher are believed now to amount to over a million[2]; they are even counted by thousands in the United States.

The story of the Báb was first written by his disciple Mirzá Jání, a merchant of Kashan, who himself suffered martyrdom at Teheran on Sept. 15th, 1852. It was, therefore, an absolutely contemporary record. This work was long believed to be lost, though a copy of it is now known to exist in the National Library at Paris. It was, in fact, driven out of the field by another work entitled the *Táríkh-i-Jadíd* or 'New History,' drawn up in the year 1880 by two disciples under the supervision of Mánakjí the

[1] They were visited by Prof. Edward G. Browne of Cambridge in 1890.

[2] Curzon, *Persia*, vol. i., page 499; Prof. Denison Ross, in *Great Religions of the World*, 1901, p. 213.

Zoroastrian,[1] while the Báb's widow and others of his relatives and friends were still alive. The book was rapidly circulated among the followers of the faith, of course in written copies, and it began immediately to take up fresh elements as it passed from hand to hand. Prof. Browne's translation rests on two texts, one in the British Museum (London), the other in his own private collection (Cambridge). They already exhibit frequent variations. Thus at the outset the full account of the predictions of the learned lecturer at Kerbelá is found only in the Cambridge Codex; the narrative of the London MS. is much briefer. The story of one of the first disciples, Mulla Huseyn, is full of slight but significant variations. On reaching Shiraz he sought out the new teacher, with whom he had previously travelled on pilgrimage to the holy shrines of Kerbelá and Nejef. 'As I approached the door, I desired inwardly to tarry there some few days. So I knocked at the door.' The two versions then continue:

Cambridge	*London*
As it chanced he came to the	Before he had opened it or seen me, I heard his voice exclaiming, 'Is it you, Mulla

[1] A translation of the New History was published by Prof. Edward G. Browne, Cambridge, 1893. The introduction describes the circumstances which led to the supersession of one book by the other.—In early Mohammedan literature the biography of the Prophet by Ibn Ishak (between 100 and 150 A.H.) was replaced by that of Ibn Hisham, who died in 213 A.H. (828 A.D.). But Ibn Hisham incorporated most of his predecessor's work, with explanations and additions which he marked, while for the omissions he gave reasons. See the translation by Dr. Gustav Weil, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1864.

door in person. *Then he opened the door.* When he had seen and recognised me, *he smiled and said,* etc.

Huseyn?' *Then he opened the door.* It did not at the time strike me how strange it was that without having seen me he should know I was there. When he had opened the door, *he smiled and said,* etc.[1]

The tendency to invest simple incidents with wonder is already at work. Here is another instance, as a distinguished professor, Mulla Muhammad Sadik, known as 'the Saint of Khurasan,' traces the spiritual struggles through which he passed before he 'could accept this illiterate and uneducated young merchant as Báb and Ká'im.'[2]

So for a while I subjected myself to a severe discipline, keeping continual vigils during the night, and praying God for help and guidance; until one night, when I had been engaged in prayer and self-abasement till near the morning, a little before dawn,

Cambridge

I came somewhat to myself, and began to reproach myself, *saying,* '*Wherefore these plaints and prayers, and this tarrying in the world of form,*' etc.

London

being wide awake, I plainly saw His Holiness appear to me *saying,* '*Wherefore these plaints and prayers, and this tarrying in the world of form,*' etc.

The Cambridge Codex attributes the final argument by which Mulla Muhammad was convinced, to the normal action of the mind resuming its own self-control after profound disturbance. The London Codex converts it into an address from the Báb himself, mysteriously seen in a vision. The sequel,

[1] *New History,* pp. 34, 35.

[2] 'He who should arise,' one of the titles of the expected manifestation, *New History,* p. 41.

common to the two, bears testimony to the deep reality of these emotions:

'At this inward communing, I was overcome with fear; but when I came to myself the veil was lifted, and I beheld within myself a state of freedom and peace transcending description.'

The author of the main narrative then continues:

'Now although I have myself with mine own eyes beheld greater wonders than those above recorded, yet am I fain to excuse myself from relating or publishing them; for that Gem of created essences [the Báb] was in no wise eager or desirous for the disclosure of such occurrences, neither did he seek to make known such evidences of power as were manifested in him, since he regarded his nature as his proof, and his verses as his sign.'

Upon this the London codex, in which we have already noted a tendency towards the marvellous, adds the following passage:

'So much was this the case that Mulla Mirza Muhammad, one of the most eminent of those divines and highly gifted men who hastened to accept the new manifestation, one who had, moreover, himself witnessed the greater part of the occurrences connected with it, and who was amongst the remnant who escaped the sword at Sheykh Tabarsí, at the request of a certain learned and eminent enquirer, set down in writing two thousand four hundred occurrences of a miraculous character which he had witnessed on the part of His Holiness, and during the siege of the Castle of Sheykh Tabarsí, on the part of *Jenáb-i-Kuddús* and his companions and supporters. But when he had completed this, he became aware that His Holiness in no wise regarded these miracles, wonders, and supernatural occurrences as a proof of his mission, and did not desire them to be published; wherefore he effaced what he had recorded in that precious book, and refrained from publishing it.'[1]

[1] Some further illustrations of the variation of the two codices may be found in the noble letter written by the Báb's young companion in prison, Muhammad Alí, two or three days before their execution together, preserved only by

If such are the variations possible in two copies of a formal narrative drawn up by three disciples within a few years of its composition—the copy in Prof. Browne's possession was given him in Persia in 1888, the book having only been written in 1880 —other forms of it among the Bábís in Persia might by this time show a still larger range of addition or modification. The conditions of the first Christian communities were not dissimilar. By the time of the Third Gospel, as the preface tells us, many narratives founded on the traditions were already in existence. Whether these covered the whole range of the Master's life, or whether some of them dealt only with fragments of teaching, or episodes in his career, we cannot tell. But it is widely believed that some form of *Mark* and of the Matthæan *logia* were among them. If on the basis of the foregoing illustrations I attempt here a very rough and provisional sketch of a conjectural history of the Synoptics, it is solely with the view of enabling the general reader to form some concrete idea of the perplexities which environ the problem, and to distinguish between what may be regarded as fairly established, and what is still only in the region of probability.

Cambridge. The London MS., on the other hand, contains a remarkable narrative derived from Haji Suleyman Khan concerning a sealed letter addressed to him by the Báb six months before his death. When opened after the execution it was found to contain a prophecy of martyrdom in six months, with instructions for the recovery and preservation of the bodies of himself and Muhammad Ali. These were duly fulfilled; on evidence for the genuineness of the letter, see *New History*, p. 310; a parallel to the miracle by which the bodies escaped change, is quoted on p. 312.

The earliest stage of all, by universal consent, was the formation of common traditions of the teaching and life of Jesus in the Apostolic circle at Jerusalem. Whether these were sufficiently organized to assume some coherence and stability, so that they could be propagated as a whole in cycles from Church to Church; whether small groups or chains of them were early gathered in little series, to illustrate the attitude of the Master (for example) towards Sabbath observance, or the nature of his teaching by parable (as in *Mark* 4); whether a series of reminiscences such as those of the first day in Capernaum (*Mark* $1^{21\text{-}38}$) or the temple colloquies (*Mark* 12) fixed themselves in the form of 'lessons' for the instruction or possibly the worship of the first believers, is matter of surmise; but there is nothing to prevent speculation from wandering among such possibilities. At any rate it is certain that a considerable group of traditions had been collected before the fall of Jerusalem, in A.D. 70, for they everywhere imply the existence of institutions, parties, officers, usages, which either ceased to be, or were wholly changed by that great catastrophe. The Sermon on the Mount pictures the disciple offering his gift at the altar, and forbids the oath by the capital, for it is the city of the great King; and the invective against the Pharisees in the last days denounces the blind guides who drew a distinction between swearing by the temple, and swearing by the temple-gold. On the other hand, there are touches here and there,

like the burning of the city in *Matt.* 22^{7}, which suggest that later feeling is at work. The parable of the wedding-feast in *Matt.* 22^{2-14} is altogether on a larger scale than the treatment of the same theme in *Luke* 14^{16-24}, and seems to belong to a later stage of the traditions. To this early period may be probably assigned the first collection of Matthew's *logia* in the vernacular Aramaic. With their reduction to written form, and their independent translation into Greek, a starting-point was found for frequent enlargement and a continuous tendency to variation.

Many of the sayings in Matthew's *logia* would belong to the stock of apostolic teaching, and to some of them, therefore, parallels might naturally occur in the Petrine recollections recorded by Mark. But it is hard to identify our Second Gospel with that primitive work. It is no mere group of unorganised anecdotes. It starts with a delineation of Messiah's fore-runner: it notes his place in the great drama of prophecy: it mysteriously indicates the hour when Jesus is adopted as the Messianic Son: and from the birth of this consciousness within him it traces the ripening of his purpose till the moment of the disciples' recognition at Caesarea Philippi. It would seem likely, then, that Mark's notes of Peter's reminiscences were afterwards thrown into consecutive form, and brought into an order more resembling our Gospel.[1] Whether it

[1] For Salmon's view see *ante*, p. 305. It is here assumed that this was in Greek. But Dr. Edwin A. Abbot pleads earnestly that the primitive form of the Triple Tradition now most nearly preserved in *Mark*, was of a very cert

contained the section 6^{45}-8^{22} has been doubted, for Luke, after following faithfully so far, takes no notice of its contents. This is the more remarkable because the story of the Syrophœnician woman would (it might be supposed) have specially appealed to him. This is one of the cases, moreover, in which Mark seems to present a later form than Matthew. The abrupt refusal of Jesus to help her, *Matt.* 15^{24}, is suppressed; and to his second answer (with its harsh comparison of non-Jews to 'dogs') is prefixed the apologetic plea, 'Let the children first be filled,' *Mark* 7^{27}. This secondary character is easily understood if the passage be a later addition. The discourse against the Scribes about Beelzebub $3^{22\text{-}30}$ has still more clearly the air of an intrusion. It interrupts the story of the endeavour of the family of Jesus to secure his person on the ground that he was insane $^{20\text{-}21}$ and $^{31\text{-}35}$; and it is introduced without any occasion, for there was nothing in the crowd which filled the house and prevented him from having a needed meal, to elicit the bitter charge of casting out devils by Beelzebub. In *Matt.* $12^{22\text{-}32}$ and *Luke* $11^{14\text{-}23}$ it follows the cure of a demoniac, dumb and blind in *Matthew*, or dumb only in *Luke*. The accusation in that connexion is intelligible; the Marcan expounder endeavours to link it on to the family assertion 'he is beside himself' by adding the significant words 'he hath Beelzebub.'[1] Such

abbreviated type in brief Hebrew sentences, which led to expansions in different directions, and by confusion of letters was often translated in different ways.

[1] Another case is probably to be found in $9^{38\text{-}40}$ which interrupts the con-

modifications once more make it possible to understand how the great eschatological discourse in *Mark* 13 should show some later traits than *Matthew's*. Thus the heavenly terrors that are to follow the tribulation of those days, will no longer take place 'immediately' (*Mark* 13^{24} contrasted with *Matt.* 24^{29}): and in ^{20} the editor can already look back in retrospect upon the mercy which 'shortened the days.' These are the signs of revision, when the horrors of the Roman war are over; and it is widely allowed, accordingly, that the present form of *Mark* must be brought down below the great catastrophe of the year 70.

The Third Gospel was not composed until competing narratives more or less complete had entered the field. The possibility that any of them was from the hand of an Apostle is practically excluded by the description of their dependence on traditions derived from eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, 1^{2}. No eye-witness, therefore, recorded his own testimony. This language has been held either to exclude the Greek *Matthew* from the range of apostolic authorship, or to show that Luke was not acquainted with a gospel which could be supposed to trace its pedigree to one of the Twelve. That the Third Evangelist employed material from various sources may be inferred from his own preface. Two of those sources are now identified with some form of *Mark* on the one hand, and of Matthew's *logia*

nexion of ^{37} and ^{41}, and seems to be derived from *Luke* 9^{49-50}; the explanatory clause in ^{39} 'for there is no man etc.' seems distinctly secondary compared with the following, 'for he that is not against us is for us.'

upon the other. These two documents will account, roughly speaking, for about three-fourths of the Gospel. There remains a considerable amount of peculiar matter, the birth-stories of John and Jesus, parables like those of the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, the Rich Man and Lazarus, incidents such as the Sermon at Nazareth, the mission of the Seventy, the cure of the ten lepers, the walk to Emmaus, which cannot be assigned to any known collection. But these are certainly not all of equal value. The origins of the birth-tales are probably to be found in the unconscious growth of legend. The immortal stories of the father awaiting the wanderer's return, of the merciful traveller who befriended one of his nation's enemies, bear the emphatic stamp of the Master's own creation. In the Sermon at Nazareth, attached to an incident which the phrase 'whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum,' 4^{23}, proves to be transposed from a later place in the true order, the Evangelist probably indicates what he took to be the true scope of the mission of Jesus; and the despatch of the Seventy, and the peculiar arrangement of the last journey which sends Jesus through Samaria instead of by the Perean route, are similar symbols intended to justify the apostolate to the Gentiles. Elements of legend, of genuine tradition, and of design, thus meet and blend. It does not appear probable that *Luke* passed through any stages comparable to those which may be conjectured for *Mark* and *Matthew*. There do not seem to be any harmonistic intrusions

to bring it into accord with either the First or the Second Gospel. Such elements as it did tend to take up into itself may be seen noted in the Revisers' margin, as in the story of the angel in Gethsemane, $22^{43,44}$, the prayer 'Father, forgive them' on the cross, 23^{34}, or the series of enrichments which may be traced through the group of narratives in 24. Whether Luke used *Matthew* either by direct copying or by dimmer reminiscence, is at present under debate, and high authorities are ranged on either side. The conclusion depends on the interpretation of minute indications of which the following is a random sample. In *Luke* 4^{16} we read that 'Jesus came to Nazara where he was brought up.' The peculiar form Nazara occurs elsewhere in the Synoptics only in *Matt.* 4^{13}, 'and leaving Nazara, he came and dwelt in Capernaum.' Of this *Mark* says nothing, and the appearance of Jesus in Capernaum (*Mark* 1^{21}) takes place without any mention of his former home. Luke, so runs the argument, therefore, brings Jesus to Nazara before he begins a ministry in Capernaum, in defiance of *Mark's* order, because he understands *Matthew* to imply that after the arrest of John the Baptist Jesus returned first to Nazara, and only subsequently settled by the Galilean lake. And yet, even if this and other cases be held to justify the view that Luke reckoned a Greek Matthew among his sources, it does not follow that it was our canonical *Matthew* in its present form.

Through how many stages our First Gospel may

have passed in a long literary career, it is impossible even to conjecture. As it reaches us, it is marked by sufficiently definite peculiarities of structure compared with either of the other two Synoptics. The author practically divides the ministry of Jesus into two unequal halves, which are introduced by the same formula :—

Matt. iv., 17.	*Matt.* xvi., 21.
From that time began Jesus to preach and to say, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.	*From that time began Jesus* to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem.

Each of the two great divisions thus formed contains large groups of the Master's teachings. These are ranged together in series, such as the Sermon on the Mount 5-7, the address to the Twelve in 10, the succession of parables in 13; or in the second part, the Woes against the Pharisees in 23, or the discourse of the Last Things in 24-25. But it can hardly be supposed that such aggregates are primary. The Sermon on the Mount is much fuller than the corresponding exhortation in *Luke* 6; portions of it may, indeed, be found elsewhere in *Luke* (*e.g.* *Matt.* $6^{25\text{-}33} = Luke\ 12^{22\text{-}31}$). In $10^{17\text{-}22}$ occurs a passage parallel with *Mark* $13^{9\ 11\text{-}13}$ (^{10} has its counterpart in *Matt.* 24^{14}). The series of parables in 13 closes at ^{34}; it finds its analogue in *Mark* 4. But additions have been made to it, especially in $^{44\text{-}50}$, and when the number seven is complete, it is formally wound up in $^{51\text{-}52}$.

Matthew thus exhibits distinct marks of literary

arrangement. There are other phenomena confirming the surmise of later origin which is thus begotten. The difference between the First and Second Gospels in the external recognition of the Messianic character of Jesus, as well as in his own attitude to the high claim, has been already noted. Baur early drew attention to the contradictions which lie here peacefully side by side. The assertions of the validity and permanence of the law, the declaration of Jesus that he is sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, the warning to the Twelve not to go to Samaria or to pass out among the Gentiles, the promise of twelve thrones to the apostles from which they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel,—these belong to the narrower Judean elements. To the opposite tendency must be reckoned the early announcement of the admission of the Gentiles to the kingdom, when its own sons are cast forth, $8^{11\text{-}12}$; the prophecy that the gospel shall be preached through the whole world, 24^{14}, 26^{13}; and the great judgment scene where all the nations are gathered, and the test of fitness for the blessed life is not privilege of race, or fulfilment of the law, or loyalty to Messiah, but simple sympathy with human need. How long a time must have been needed for such opposites to lose their pungency of antagonism and find reconciliation among the words of the same Teacher! To these may be added the imposing declaration with which the Gospel closes. The baptismal formula may have undergone subsequent alteration to harmonise it with the usage of a

later age ;[1] but if the form in 28^{19} really belongs to the original text, it would seem to be later than that of *Acts* 2^{38} 8^{16} 10^{48} 19^{5}, and is only known otherwise in the second century. To this post-apostolic period would also belong such stories as those which gather round Peter in $14^{28\text{-}31}$, or $17^{24\text{-}27}$; the public act by which Pilate disowned responsibility for the death of Jesus, as though the writer sought to exonerate the Roman authority, and throw the guilt on Israel; the legend of Judas with its explanatory note in 27^{8}; the marvels attending the crucifixion, $27^{51\text{-}53}$; and the allusions in $27^{62\text{-}66}$ $28^{11\text{-}15}$ to Jewish explanations of the resurrection.[2] There is even reason to suspect that additions may have been made to *Matthew* in the second century as to *Luke*. From the language of Justin in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, 107-108, it may be inferred that he was unacquainted with the explanation of the Jonah-sign in 12^{40}; may we, in like manner, interpret the silence of Irenaeus[3] to imply that he was unacquainted with the declaration 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church' 16^{18}?

[1] See F. C. Conybeare, in the *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1902, p. 102.

[2] Recognised instances of growth by composition are found in such books as *Enoch*, the *Apocalypse*, and possibly *Colossians* and the letters to Timothy.

[3] Comp. *Adv. Haer.* iii. 18, 4; 13, 2; and 21, 8. It is surprising that he should make no reference to the words in his argument on behalf of Rome, iii. 3, 2. They are for the first time so employed in the treatise against gambling, *De Aleatoribus*, ascribed by Harnack to Victor, Bishop of Rome, 189-199 (*Texte u. Unters.* V. pp. 13, 93 ff.). They do not occur in the Clementine Recognitions, but lie at the back of a passage in the Homilies, xvii. 19. The *Recognitions* are assigned by Salmon (*Dict. Eccl. Biogr.* i. p. 577) to about 200 : the *Homilies* to a later date, possibly 218.

The order which thus emerges, *Mark, Luke, Matthew,* must be understood in reference to their main contents. It is, for instance, conceivable that *Mark* may have received its final touches after *Luke* was composed; just as the possibility has been already suggested that *Luke* may have derived suggestions from a *Matthew* preceding our Canonical First Gospel. Concerning these more delicate problems no certainty is attainable. But the series just displayed has the support of critics of various schools from Herder at the close of the eighteenth century to Westcott and Zahn on the one side, and Pfleiderer and Wernle on the other, at the close of the nineteenth.[1] It remains to ask whether there is any sort of consensus as to the actual dates to which the Gospels may be probably assigned. The question is no less intricate than that of their order. One prominent consideration is found in the universal acknowledgment that the author of the Fourth Gospel was acquainted with the other three. If the date of that work can be determined, there would seem to be a fixed limit below which the composition of the Synoptics cannot pass, and yet, the conception of successive editions or revisions, of enlargements and insertions, at different dates, throws even this reasoning into some uncertainty. Towards a common era for the Fourth Gospel some approximation has been made (as will be seen in the next Lecture) by students of different schools, though it must be admitted that the exceptions are weighty.

[1] The leading opinions of the last ten years will be found tabulated below.

It must suffice now to mention but two representative names, those of Sanday and Harnack. For the Fourth Gospel Prof. Sanday proposes a date about 90 A.D; while Prof. Harnack offers a wider range, from 80 to 110, with a distinct preference for the lower limit. Accordingly, the series will begin with *Mark,* in its present form somewhat later than 70; *Luke* and *Matthew* will follow at intervals which cannot be precisely determined.[1] Even if the First Gospel continued to receive additions in the second century, the mass of its contents doubtless arose in the first: though its close, which seems to belong to the present structure of the whole work, appears to me to imply a date at least as advanced as 100 A.D.[2]

[1] The view that Luke was acquainted with the *Antiquities* of Josephus (published about 93-4 A.D.) has not been received with favour in this country, though it has found strenuous supporters in Germany. Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, ed. 2, 1902, vol. i., p. 547, considers that the investigations of Max Krenkel, *Josephus und Lukas*, have brought the dependence of the Third Gospel on the 'Antiquities' into the sphere of definite fact. The priority of *Matthew* before the other two is still maintained by Hilgenfeld and Holsten in the Tübingen succession, and by Mr. F. C. Badham in his able little books on the *Formation of the Gospels*, 1892, and *St. Mark's Indebtedness to St. Matthew*, 1897.

[2] In the following table an attempt is made to collect some of the opinions of the last ten years, starting from Prof. Sanday's article 'Gospels' in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd ed. 1893, vol I., part ii.

COMPOSITION OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

	Matthew.	*Mark.*	*Luke.*
Abbott [1]	Elements of 'earliest tradition' and of 'a very much later date.'	Before *Matthew* or *Luke.*	79 or 96.
Allen [2]	Probably after 70.	Before rather than after 70.	Probably after 70.
Bacon [3]	80-90.	71-72.	78-93.
Bartlet [4]	About 68-9.	After 64.	About 75.
Bruce [5]	Shortly after 70.	Uncertain whether before or after 70.	Possibly as late as 90.
Gould [6]		About 70.	
Harnack [7]	70-75, except some additions.	65-70.	78-93.
Holtzmann [8]	After 70.	About 70.	After 100.
Jülicher [9]	About 100.	After 70.	80-120.
McGiffert [10]	81-96.	After 70.	78-93.
Menzies [11]		Not long after 70.	
Moffatt [12]	75-90.	65-75.	80-95.
Pfleiderer [13]	After Luke.	70-80.	Not before 100.
Plummer [14]			75-80.
Réville [15]	*Logia* before 70: redaction, 98-117.	Proto-Mark, 70-75: redaction, 98-117.	Redaction, 98-117.
Sanday [16]	Before 80.	Soon after 70.	75-80.
Schmiedel [17]	About 130.	After 70.	100-110.
Swete [18]		70, before July.	
B. Weiss [19]	Soon after 70.	67-69.	Not after 80.
Zahn [20]	*Logia*, 62; Greek about 85.	About 67.	About 75.

[1] 'Gospels,' in *Encyl. Biblica*, 1901. [2] 'Modern Criticism and the New Testament,' in *Contentio Veritatis*, 1902. [3] *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1900. [4] *The Apostolic Age*, 1900. [5] *Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. 1897. [6] 'St. Mark,' *International Critical Commentary*, 1896. [7] *Chronol. der Altchristl. Literatur*, i. 1897. [8] '*Die Synoptiker*' in the *Hand-Commentar*, 3rd ed., 1901. [9] *Einleitung in das N.T.*, 4th ed., 1901. [10] *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897. [11] *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901. [12] *The Historical New Testament*, 1901. [13] *Das Urchristenthum*, 2nd ed., 1902. [14] 'St. Luke' in *International Critical Commentary*, 1896. [15] *Jesus de Nazareth*, 1897. [16] 'Gospels' in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*,[2] 1893. [17] 'Gospels' in *Encycl. Biblica*, 1901. [18] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1902. [19] *Die Vier Evangelien*, 1902. [20] Quoted by Moffatt, *Historical N.T.*

PART. II.: THE HISTORIC INVESTIGATION

WHILE the literary enquiries which marked the study of the Gospels during the last third of the nineteenth century were slowly advancing, new interest was awakened in the historic investigation of the life of Jesus from various causes. The decline of the older Evangelical theory, changed views of the constitution and value of human nature, the moral criticism of theories of vicarious atonement, all tended to transfer the centre of Christian interest from Paul to Christ. From quite another side fresh ideas were to be applied to the Gospels as the fountain-heads of the teaching of the Church. The idea of development had long been admitted in tracing the successive phases of ecclesiastical doctrine. Might it not provide an important key to different aspects of thought in the New Testament? This had, of course, been the main thesis of Baur, under the system of movement by opposition, action and reaction issuing in reconciliation, inherited from the Hegelian philosophy. But it was now to be attempted on a wider scale, and with more significant results. On the one hand, in the first generation of the century, Schleiermacher had passionately exclaimed, 'I hate in religion this idea of historical relations; each religion has its own eternal necessity, and has always its own independent origin.'[1] On the other, the efforts of the last gen-

[1] Quoted by Pfleiderer, *The Development of Theology*, 1890, p. 53.

eration have been chiefly occupied with determining how far and in what manner the origins of Christianity can be brought into connexion with the principle of Evolution.

I.

The scope of this attempt was at first naturally restrained. The materials were limited, and philosophical views of historical causation could only make their way with difficulty into a region fenced round with preconceptions of the supernatural. Yet it could not be denied that whatever else he might be Jesus Christ had been born as a Jew and the first steps in the new enquiry were directed to the collection of material to illustrate his physical, social and religious environment. In Egypt and Mesopotamia the simple use of the spade had already worked wonders and buried civilisations were fast yielding their treasures to the light of day. No student of classical art could neglect the data of inscriptions or the significance of Greek politics and law. No historian of England would attempt to describe the struggles of the civil wars without visiting their battlefields or to account for Milton and Wordsworth apart from the conditions of their time. The new study had to begin at the beginning. Palestine must be surveyed as no country had been surveyed before, and a spirit of thoroughness inspired to produce a map such as Kiepert and Guthe and Conder had made it possible to obtain.

unlearned eye.[1] The Gospels were thus brought into the field of actual reality. Other studies naturally followed. Just as Mr. Holman Hunt devoted years of patient labour in the Syrian sunshine that he might realise the temple and its doctors at Jerusalem, or the carpenter's work-bench at Nazareth, so the scholar dived into the great treasury of Jewish lore, and out of the vast collections of the Talmud, out of the histories of Josephus, the varied allusions to Jewish culture in the classical writers, or the philosophical writings of Philo of Alexandria, sought to reconstruct the picture of the social life of the people, delineate their institutions, and describe their worship, their parties, and their sects. It has been already noted that both Ewald and Keim sought to place the founder of Christianity in the closest relation to the circumstances of his age.[2] Their labours were continued in Germany by Hausrath and Schürer. In this country the state of general feeling was reflected in the lives of Jesus by Farrar and Geikie; the most notable contribution being made by Dr. Edersheim, who poured out a rich store of Jewish learning in the pages of his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (1883).

[1] One of the great impulses to this study in this country was given by Stanley in his delightful work *Sinai and Palestine*; he found an ally in Mr. (afterwards Sir George) Grove in the excellent geographical articles contributed to Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*. The general want of historic imagination may be illustrated by a story related thirty years or more ago by the Rev. Barham Zincke, one of the Queen's chaplains. Returning from a visit to Egypt and Syria, he told his gardener that he had been to Jerusalem. 'Jerusalem, Sir!' said the man in great surprise: 'Why I thought that was *only a Bible word*.' And this after Cook's tours had begun.

[2] Lect. V. pp. 273, 381.

But after all, this touched only the framework. The scene was there, but that no one had ever doubted. It was much to conceive it more clearly; but it was useless to deny that there were questions beyond. Archæology might reconstruct the stage of the Gospel story, but it could not guarantee the action of the great drama. What, after all, actually happened? The intrinsic significance of Jesus, the whole story of primitive Christianity, depended on something more than a knowledge of the geography of Galilee or Perea, the simple ritual of the synagogue, the determination of the successions of the high-priests, or the settlement of the constitution of the Sanhedrîn. The documents were not proved to be free from party tendencies because they did not misplace Bethlehem, or historically accurate (as a modern historian understands accuracy) because they gave correct details of the city administration of Thessalonica or Philippi. The fact of the differences in the Gospel representations after all remained: and the necessity of testing them historically could not be evaded. The Tübingen criticism had fixed on a particular explanation. The determining factor in the early Church was the struggle between the Jewish and the Gentile parties. The heroes of it had been Peter and Paul; its watchwords 'the Law' and 'the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.' The first evidence of the conflict had been found in Paul's own letters. But it had lasted long after his death; it continued in the first part of the second

century; and only as its vehemence began to die away did the Gospels appear and embody the reconciliation. We have seen already that the general voice of modern criticism, in spite of some conspicuous exceptions, has carried the Gospels back into the age that followed the deaths of the two great apostles. But it cannot be denied that such a struggle did take place. The problem of the relation of the Gentiles to the obligations of the Law was an inevitable one. The opposition to which Baur pointed did arise. But it neither lasted so long, nor possessed such significance for the development of Christianity, as he supposed. The discovery of such a document as the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, first published by Archbishop Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, in 1883, showed at once what other interests were engaging attention in the Church in an age when Baur had argued that it was absorbed in the antithesis of the Petrine and Pauline tendencies. The age of the book, to be sure, is uncertain like that of so many other items of early Christian literature. Harnack assigns it to the period 131-160 A.D., while other eminent critics place it earlier; Dr. Abbott, for example,[1] suggesting 80-110. The Logia in a fragment of papyrus found at Oxyrhynchus, though they, too, cannot be dated, supply another link in the general chain of evidence for carrying back the written collections of Jesus' teaching to an earlier period; and this is also the conclusion suggested by the

[1] 'Gospels,' *Enc. Bibl.* ii. col. 1827.

fragments of the Gospel of Peter brought to light at Akhmim.

From another point of view also it may be urged that the cleavage on which Baur rested his whole conception was by no means so sharp or fundamental as he supposed.[1] On the one hand the Jewish party was by no means homogeneous, and showed many gradations of strictness. The conduct of Peter in eating with the Gentile Christians at Antioch was much less rigid than that of James, the Lord's brother, as described by Hegesippus. Nor did the two leaders divide the churches between them. If there was a party of Paul at Corinth, and another of Peter, there was also one of Apollos, and even one of Christ (*1 Cor.* 1^{12}). And on the other hand, if Peter was a Jew, no less so was Paul. Trained under a distinguished Pharisee, his modes of thought and feeling were those of a Jew. His ideas, his reasonings, had their origin in the Scribal schools. He shares the Palestinian view of time with its transition from this age to the age to come. He divides the world between God and Satan. The seven heavens—into the third of which he had himself been caught up—are filled with a celestial hierarchy; and the spiritual powers of evil are to be brought to nought by the design of God. The entire conception of the Messiahship of the Son of God, his exaltation at the right hand of the Father, his return in glory amid a retinue of angels, the rise

[1] Cp. H. Holtzmann, 'Baur's N. T. Criticism in the Light of the Present, *New World*, June, 1894.

of the dead as the great trumpet pealed across the world, the judgment seat of Christ,—all these belong to the teaching of the Synagogue, and only differ from it in being realised in the person of Jesus. Even the doctrines which have commonly been supposed to be peculiar or original to Paul, of sin, atonement, and justification, are now known to have their affinities and connexions with the moral theology of the Pharisees. They are but branches from a common stock, transformed under the Christian experience of the apostle

Moreover, a third order of modifying considerations was recognised in new influences the significance of which Baur only imperfectly appreciated. When the Gospel was carried beyond its native hills, and the Gentiles began to press into the Church, what modes of thought did they bring with them? With what view of the world did they combine their new faith? What habits of mind, what types of moral feeling, did they transfer from the old faith? The antecedents of the Greek were different from those of the Jew: and it might be surmised that when the first Christian teachers began to address the cultivated Greek, trained in his own philosophy, some links of common understanding must be first established between them. It was inevitable, therefore, that contact with Hellenic thought should profoundly modify some aspects of Christian doctrine on its Hebrew side. That influence had already begun within the field of Judaism itself, and Philo of Alexandria, who had applied the conceptions of

Plato and the Stoics to the interpretation of the Law, soon became the teacher of the thinkers of the Church. The persons of the patriarchal narratives were represented as the embodiments of ideal types; the incidents of the stories were displayed not as events, but as phases of moral experience; and the crude and antique elements in the primitive thought of Israel were thus accommodated to the more refined imagination of the educated Greek. Even Paul himself, it has been suspected by distinguished critics, was not unaffected in his later years by such modes of thought; and some remarkable features in the letters to the Philippians and Colossians have often found their explanation in this view. It is admitted by a still larger number of writers that the Epistle to the Hebrews represents an early type of Christian *gnosis*, which undertook to vindicate the superiority of Christianity over Judaism by showing that in the realm of the unseen and ideal, the sanctuary on high, Messiah, at once victim and priest, offered a more perfect sacrifice than the ancient law had ever provided. The ritual of Moses was thus done away on earth, but spiritually continued in heaven. Similar conceptions, though in ruder shape, were exhibited in the letter bearing the name of Barnabas, variously placed by one group of scholars (*e.g.* Prof. Sanday) between 70 and 79, and by others (like Prof. Harnack) in 130-1. The most impressive instance of this amalgamation of two modes of thought, the Fourth Gospel, will be discussed in the next Lecture. Its influence on that

work did not, of course, escape Baur's penetration. But by placing it in the middle of the second century, he ignored the indications that this tendency was in reality of much older date, and was itself the chief factor in the progress of Christian thought. Nothing, in truth, is more remarkable than the rapid disappearance of the doctrines which we especially associate with Paul. The reason was that they were not congenial in their Jewish form to the Greek imagination. They needed translation into modes of thought and feeling more intelligible to the Hellenic mind. But that is only another way of saying that in the development of Christianity the action and reaction of Petrine and Pauline tendencies could no longer be regarded as the most prominent or most potent forces. The real key lay in a Christianised Hellenism which dropped the Pharisaic elements in the teaching of Paul, and went forward along the pathway opened up by 'John.'[1]

II.

Once more, however, behind the problems of the influences affecting the development of the Church lie the further questions connected with the life of Christ. What light is thrown upon these, either by the critical examination of the Gospels themselves, or by the general study of the history of religion? These are vast topics, which have engaged the

[1] On this great theme see Harnack's *History of Dogma*, and Pfleiderer's *Urchristenthum*.

attention of hundreds of earnest enquirers with different results. To expound all the answers would require a library instead of a lecture. Here it is only possible to offer a few illustrations of the change which is slowly coming over the treatment of some prominent themes.

In the first place it must be noted that no Christian can approach the Gospels for the first time in the same way in which he may approach the records of other historic religions. The famous maxim about interpreting the New Testament like any other book rests, after all, on an illusion. We are familiar with its contents from our childhood; and we come to the critical study of the records with impressions, affections, sympathies, beliefs, which often make it exceedingly difficult for us to look at them in any other light than that to which our minds have been always accustomed.

On the one hand—to state the contrast in its extremest form—the Church presents to us the figure of a unique person whose speech and act are entirely divine. The narratives which report them are unerring history. His teaching is a message from heaven, supernaturally guarded against error. Whatever he says, is the utterance of the Eternal Thought; Omniscience speaks through his simplest word. Whatever he does is the manifestation of Omnipotence; his will can set in motion the Almighty power that pervades the world. In the presence of this august conception the estimate of his language or his deeds will be controlled by the

prior conviction of what he *is*; and the evidence of the Gospels will be interpreted by the believer's faith. A presumption of infallibility is set up beforehand for each saying; and on the supposition that the inspired record cannot err, each incident is equally authentic. The essential meaning of the story always lies in the nature that thus deigns to display itself; and this nature supplies at once the explanation and the guarantee of the events through which it is made manifest.[1] Infinite power, goodness, truth, and love, pervade the Gospels from the beginning to the end.

In fullest contrast to this stands the conception of Jesus as a historical person. He is born at a specific date in a particular country, and at once enters into relation to his people and his age. In his modes of thought and teaching, as in his character and action, there are elements that are due to his race and land. He uses one intellectual idiom because he is a Jew and not a Greek; he uses another because he belongs to Nazareth or Jerusalem and not to Alexandria. Nor is that all: he is surrounded by a vehement conflict of parties, by

[1] Thus, the Rev. J. R. Illingworth writes (*Divine Immanence*, 1898, p. 84), 'The Incarnation is the inevitable presupposition of its miracles. If Jesus Christ was the divine Author of our human life and death, it is manifestly absurd to say that He could not, or would not, heal the sick and raise the dead. Such miracles taken by themselves, would be in the last degree improbable; but as the results of an Incarnation they are so probable that we should even call them natural. Thus the incredibility of the mode entirely vanishes, if the fact be true; and we can never ask about a Christian miracle simply, 'Is it likely to have happened?' but 'Is it likely to have happened, if Christ was God?'

passionate cries for national independence, by strange and excited expectations, the product of long ages of hope and fear, of suffering and agitation. The teaching of the schools, the popular ideals, the political and religious aims of leaders or sects, —what did all these mean for him, what was his attitude towards them? How far did he frame any definite conceptions to himself of his own function? had he worked out any programme of action? what outlook had he towards the future? what was it that determined his resolve to go to Jerusalem? and what did he hope to do as he rode in triumph up the steep slope from the Kidron to the city? These are the kind of questions which we should ask concerning the founders of other great historic movements in philosophy or religion. So might we examine the career of Socrates, or Gotama the Buddha. And in the latter case, although uncounted millions have for nigh two thousand years devoutly believed the author of their faith to be the manifestation of the Infinite and the Eternal, the Self-Existent and the Absolute, we should enter on the inquiry with the presupposition that he was a man.

It need not be said that between the two extremes thus briefly sketched there are many intermediate positions. We are not concerned, however, with their theological aspects, but with their attitude towards the records. And in this connexion may be noted first a greater sensitiveness to degrees in the amount, the force, the value, of testimony. Forty years ago, for example, the biographer of Jesus could

write as follows of the events attending the crucifixion (*Matt.* $27^{52\text{-}53}$):

'Many who were dead rose from their graves, although they returned to the dust again after this great token of Christ's quickening power had been given to many: they were "saints" that slept—probably those who had most earnestly longed for the salvation of Christ were the first to take the fruits of His conquest of death.'[1]

The modern student, however, like Prof. Sanday, does not hesitate to rebuke another historian, Mr. Goldwin Smith, for the assertion that 'the evidence upon which the miraculous darkness and the apparition of the dead rest is the same as that upon which all the miracles rest, and must be accepted or rejected in all cases alike.'[2] On the contrary, says Prof. Sanday, 'No critical student needs to be told that the evidence for the apparitions of the dead belongs just to that stratum which carries with it the least weight.'[3] The passage, that is to say, is an obvious addition to the narrative of *Mark* on which

[1] Archbishop Thomson, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. i. (1863) p. 1070. It will be noticed here that the writer goes beyond the Gospel narrative in describing the second death of the revivified bodies after they had walked about the streets of Jerusalem.

[2] Art. 'Jesus Christ,' in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 626. 'When Prof. Goldwin Smith insists that all the miracles recorded in the Gospels stand or fall together, he is going in the teeth, not so much of anything peculiar to the study of the Gospels, but of the historical method generally.'

[3] The sequel is worth adding as an indication of the need felt by candid minds to bring their conceptions into harmony with science: 'The authority for the darkness is much higher, but its miraculous character need not be magnified. Any unusual darkening of the sky would naturally strike the imagination of the disciples; and it might be not contrary to nature, and yet also not accidental.'

Matthew builds. It is, therefore, of a secondary character. It does not appear in *Luke,* and gains no reinforcement from the Fourth Gospel; so that Dr. Gore can declare that 'it rests on grounds of evidence immensely weaker than the common matter of the Gospels, or, indeed, than the most of what is not common.'[1] In other words, the statement of a single Evangelist is no longer sufficient of itself to establish a fact.

It may be remarked, however, that the evidence which is thus by implication inadequate for the resurrection of the saints at the crucifixion, is by the same authorities judged ample to guarantee the final scene upon the Galilean mount, when the risen Christ gives to the Church through the eleven disciples its great commission to make disciples of all the nations, and declares his perpetual presence with it to the end of the age.[2] But another investigator reads this in a different light. To Dr. A. B. Bruce the story is not an actual report of what Jesus said, it expresses 'the developed Christian consciousness of the Catholic Church.'[3] The hope of the return of Jesus began to fade away. The end of the world and the advent of the Son of Man did not take place. The Church had to accommodate itself to new conditions in a scene that showed no likelihood of change. The emphasis on baptism (nowhere else named in the Gospel), 'the full-blown universalism, the Trinitarian formula, and the promise of a perpetual spiritual

[1] *The Pilot*, Aug. 10th, 1901. [2] *Matt.* 28^{16-20}.

[3] *Apologetics*, in the Internat. Theol. Library, 1892, pp. 463-5.

presence,' are thus the notes of a later age; and the command from which the Church believes itself to have derived its authority is only an idealised utterance placed in the mouth of Christ as a symbol rather than a fact.[1] The ground of rejection here is the incongruity of the passage with the language which is elsewhere ascribed to Jesus on the united testimony of the First Three Gospels.

The influences at work in the case just cited are sufficiently clear. The story, that is to say, admits of a psychological explanation. Those who were accustomed to think in symbols conveyed their ideas in forms which wore the guise of history, yet had never really occurred.[2] But sometimes such a key was lost, and the result may be seen, for instance, in the strange incident of the withering of the fig-tree, *Mark* $11^{12\text{-}14, 20\text{-}25}$, *Matt.* $21^{18\text{-}22}$. The story is told in two forms, but the two narratives of our evangelists do not double the testimony, for it is widely recognised that Matthew's is founded upon Mark's,[3] and by condensing the incidents of two mornings into

[1] Cp. *the Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. i. p. 340. For a similar view see the *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed. 1890, p. 368.

[2] Thus Thomas of Celano, one of the companions of Saint Francis of Assisi, relates how in one of the last years of his life the saint celebrated the Nativity of Jesus with all the realism which the Catholic Church has since learned to love so well. He had his manger and his oxen, and the fittings of the stall were reared in the little church. Thither came all the people of the neighbourhood, as all night he kept the sacred watch. And lo, within the manger was seen the holy Child. Over him bent the saint in lowly reverence, and the babe awoke and stretched out his arms to him. Even so, says the good brother, when the child Jesus was forgotten in many hearts, was he raised up anew by his servant Francis.

[3] See the Commentaries, from various points of view, of Gould, Weiss, Swete, and Menzies.

one heightens the effect of the miracle, which thus takes place before the disciples' very eyes. Every one remembers the story of the fig-tree standing by the roadside as Jesus went in from Bethany to Jerusalem. Its bright spring foliage made it noticeable even from a distance, and Jesus, hungering as he walked, went up to it to look for figs. But he found nothing but leaves, for, says the Evangelist expressly, 'it was not the season for figs.' There is no need to recite the doom that followed. Why should the tree be fatally blasted, because it did not bear fruit out of season? It is gravely pleaded that 'the special point of the miracle appears to be that whereas, where leaves are on the fig-tree, fruit ought to be also, on the particular tree which came under our Lord's notice there was a premature leaf-bearing without any corresponding fruitfulness.'[1] But this deliberately reverses the situation described by the Evangelist. If 'it was not the season for figs,' how can it be urged that leaves and fruit were due together? Is that the case with an apple-tree in June? To assert that where leaves are, fruit ought to be also, is thus to 'go in the teeth' (to use Prof. Sanday's phrase) not only of the author of the Gospel, but of the Author of nature. On the strange sequel by which Jesus, urging the disciples to have faith in God, encourages them to attempt similar wonders, it is not necessary here to enlarge.[2] Luke relates no such story. But he reports, instead, a

[1] Dr. Gore in *The Pilot*, Aug. 17th, 1901.

[2] See the probable connexion traced by Menzies.

parable of an unfruitful tree, whose owner bade the gardener cut it down, yet spared it at his intercession to see if under proper husbandry it might recover, *Luke* 13^{6-9}. It has been often suggested that this was the real form of the original story. A parable of Israel's opportunities and the grievous failure of its fine show of religion has been converted into an actual incident. The process may be found conjecturally traced elsewhere.[1] It is only needful now to notice that the miracle is defended solely on the prior ground of the supernatural character of Jesus. We see in it, writes Dr. Gore, 'the penetrating moral judgment of our Lord exhibited in consciously symbolic action in a most convincing form.' And even more emphatically could Dr. Edersheim declare:

'It seems almost an inward necessity, not only symbolically, but really also, that Christ's Word should have laid it [the fig-tree] low. We cannot conceive that any other should have eaten of it after the hungering Christ had in vain sought fruit thereon. We cannot conceive that anything should resist Christ, and not be swept away. We cannot conceive that the reality of what He had taught, should not, when occasion came, be visibly placed before the eyes of the disciples. Lastly, we seem to feel (with *Bengel*) that, as always, the manifestation of His true Humanity, in hunger, should be accompanied by that of His Divinity, in the power of His word of judgment.'[2]

There is, however, another side. The great storehouse of Jewish traditional lore, the Talmud,

[1] See *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed., p. 199; Prof. Cheyne in *Encycl. Bibl.*, art. 'Fig;' and the admirable exposition of Prof. Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901, pp. 208-213.

[2] *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii., p. 375.

tells us of the mysterious and terrible power attaching to the curse of a Rabbi, which was even regarded as infallibly fatal. It was called the serpent of the Rabbis, whose bite was incurable.[1] Similarly we read that in Samoa the eye of a certain high priest and prophet bearing the title Tupai might work like destruction: 'if he looked at a cocoanut tree, it died; if he glanced at a breadfruit tree, it withered away.'[2] Are we to degrade Jesus to the level of a Samoan magic-man?

The truth is that the studies of the last generation have brought to light a wide range of facts showing that from the lowest forms of savage cults up to the more refined beliefs of the higher religions the presence of the miraculous is invariable. Five hundred years before our era the great teacher named Gotama the Buddha was passing to and fro in the Ganges valley between Benares and Patna, seeking, in the beautiful language of the Buddhist texts, to 'lift off from the world the veils of ignorance and sin.' The sacred books in which his teaching is recorded,[3] are believed to have been substantially completed at a relatively early date[4]; certainly the traditions were fixed long before the middle of the third century B.C., when King Asoka

[1] See further illustrations in Farrar's *History of Interpretation*, p. 441. He quotes a significant saying, 'The curse of a Rabbi comes to pass even when it is without cause,' *Sanhedrin*, f. 20, 2.

[2] G. Turner, *Samoa*, 1884, p. 23.

[3] See *ante*, Lect. II., p. 49.

[4] See the argument for the Sutta Pitaka in the 'Dialogues of the Buddha' translated by Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol. ii.

visited the holy birth-place, and recorded his acts of pious homage in an inscription.[1] According to these traditions the future Buddha descended from the Tusita heaven, and became miraculously incarnate in his mother's womb. Mighty portents marked his birth; and on his name-day a Brahman foretold his future greatness.[2] When he grows up, and after seven years of spiritual struggle obtains the insight which makes him a blessed Buddha, teacher of gods and men, nature again bears testimony to his greatness. He is tempted by Māra, the embodiment of the lust of the world. He gives sight to the blind; he feeds five hundred Brethren at once at the monastery in the Jeta-grove out of a basket of cakes with a little milk and ghee, prepared for a miserly old couple.[3] A disciple walking across the river on the surface of the water to hear the Master preach, quails as he sees the waves in the middle and begins to sink, but makes an act of joyful confidence in the Buddha, and reaches the other side in safety.[4] Gotama predicts his death three months before the

[1] Discovered in 1896. For the general history, and translations of the edicts and inscriptions, see *Asoka* by Vincent A. Smith, 1901, in the 'Rulers of India' series.

[2] See the story told in the *Dīgha Nikāya* (ed. Rhys Davids and Carpenter), vol. ii. pp. 12-16, of an earlier Buddha, Vipassī. The literary origins of this narrative and its connexion with the story in the Introduction to the Jātaka book, I hope some day to examine. For the Brahman Asita see *S.B.E.* x. 'Sutta Nipāta,' p. 125.

[3] *The Jātaka*, vol. i. transl. by Chalmers, p. 197.

[4] *The Jātaka*, Engl. trans. vol. ii. p. 77; cp. *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed., p. 204. Hiuen Tsiang, immediately before the story of the blind Nāga who received his sight, relates a miracle of the Buddha himself 'walking on the water as on land,' Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, vol. ii., p. 132.

event, and the earth quakes in sympathy; he afterwards undergoes transfiguration in the presence of two disciples; and when the hour of mortal dissolution at last arrives, another mighty earthquake follows his decease.[1] Here is an environment of wonder which presents no difficulty to the devout Buddhist, who brings to it the needful presupposition that his Teacher is in fact the great Deliverer who rescues him from the bondage of suffering, ignorance, and sin. Is the historian, however, told that the legends of the Indian sage cannot be brought so near in time to his own career as the Gospels are now placed to that of Christ? The difference of a decade or two, or even half a century, is hardly material, for those who have realised the atmosphere of symbols, types, figures, allegories, in the midst of which even now the career of an Eastern religious teacher may be involved.[2] An instance from another field may make this plain.

Attention has been already invited to some of the literary phenomena displayed by different copies

[1] See the 'Book of the Great Decease' in *Buddhist Suttas*, Sacred Books of the East, vol. xi. tr. T. W. Rhys Davids. The text will be found in the 'Mahā-Parinibbāna Sutta' in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, vol. ii. In Buddhist thought the renunciation of life by the Buddha was a more sacred moment even than his death itself. Dr. Windisch, *Māra und Buddha*, 1895, has called attention to a curious parallel in the expansion of the story in the later Sanskrit text of the *Divyâvadāna* (ed. Cowell and Neil, 1886) xvii., p. 203, to the account of the resurrection of the saints in *Matt.* 27. As soon as the great resolve was made, out of innumerable mountain-caves and holes in the rocky hills came hundreds of thousands of departed *Ṛ*ishis, who were admitted by the Blessed One into orders, and, laying aside all sin, attained the highest grade of holiness (arahatship).

[2] See the Life of *Rāma-Krishna* by the late Prof. Max Müller.

of the biography of the young Persian, the Báb.[1] He, too, was believed by his companions to have wrought miracles abundantly. At the moment of his birth he exclaimed 'the kingdom is God's.' His school-days were full of prodigies; he announced the occurrence of earthquakes or the sex of unborn children; he healed the sick, whether with contact or at a distance[2]; he foretold the death of a disciple nineteen days before its occurrence; he converted his guards; an Indian believer, on first beholding the glory of his person even in captivity, fell swooning to the ground; he predicted his own death six months in advance, naming the day.[3] These incidents were all recorded by his followers during the life-time of his widow and many of his disciples, whose narratives afford precious insight into what may be called 'miracle in the making.' Among the most significant of such stories is the account of the Báb's transfiguration on his ride from Shiraz to Isfahan in 1846.[4]

The Báb had been arrested in his own house at Shiraz; his goods had been confiscated, his uncle bastinadoed, and the Báb himself was consigned to the custody of the chief constable. That functionary's son fell sick of the pestilence and came nigh to death's door, when the Báb prayed for him and

[1] See *ante*, p. 325.

[2] Even the water in which he had washed his hands was used as a cure for divers maladies, and proved most efficacious, *New History*, p. 351.

[3] See the *New History*, where an index to the miracles will be found on p. 445.

[4] *New History*, pp. 205-7.

he recovered. The grateful father advised the Teacher to flee. A disciple named Muhammad Hasan was charged to go into the market-place on a certain day, to buy three horses with specific marks for a fixed price, and bring them to an appointed rendezvous. The wondering follower fulfilled the commission; the horses were found and purchased; the meeting with the fugitive was effected; and the Báb started with Muhammad Hasan, another disciple named Seyyid Kazim, and a muleteer. The narrative which follows is related by Muhammad Hasan, and recorded by Haji Mirza Jani.

'On another occasion, it being an extremely dark night, sleep overtook me on the road. When I awoke, I missed His Holiness. I urged on my horse for some considerable distance, but, advance as I might, I could discover no trace of him. After proceeding some way, I saw Aka Seyyid Kazim and the muleteer, who had also been overcome with sleep. I awoke them and asked them about His Holiness, but they too knew not what had become of him. I was much amazed and disquieted, but, even as I wondered, I heard the voice of His Holiness over against me, saying, "Aka Muhammad Hasan, why are you troubled? Come!"'

What follows depends partly for its effect on the peculiar character attached to certain letters and their corresponding figures. The first letter of the Persian alphabet, *Alif*,[1] has the numerical value *one*, and was a recognised emblem of the Unity of the Godhead. In form it rises, lithe and sinuous, above the line.

'I looked, and saw the form of His Holiness erect in the saddle like the *Alif* which is symbolical of the Divine Unity, while

[1] The Hebrew *Aleph*.

a continuous flow of light hung like a veil round about him, and rose heavenwards. And this light so encompassed him, forming as it were a halo round about him, that the eye was dazzled by it, and a state of disquietude and perturbation was produced. On beholding this, Aka Seyyid Kazim uttered a loud cry and swooned away. The muleteer, however, observed nothing.'

The artlessness of the narrator does not conceal the fact that the vision affected the disciples only. It had, however, a tragic sequel, though the immediate issue sounds almost ludicrously modern.

'Then His Holiness dismounted and said, "*Make some tea!*" And he took Aka Seyyid Kazim's head on his bosom, and fed him with tea until he was somewhat recovered; yet he was never again the same as before, and continued thus fey, until, as the effect of that vision of glory, he yielded up his spirit in Isfahan to Him who is the Lord of Glory. His Supreme Holiness was present at his funeral, and alone read the prayers over him.'[1]

Such is the atmosphere of devotion which a modern Teacher can create around him. The Bábís see in their Master a manifestation of the Primal Will. 'Were it otherwise,' says a believer, 'so great a multitude of expert doctors and devout seekers after truth would assuredly not have accepted him as a divine manifestation, nor rapturously laid down their lives for love of his surpassing beauty, and longing for union with him.'[2] So, theories of incarnation as yet undefined flash and gleam about his person. The records of the heroic Bábí martyrs, noble and merchant, scholar and peasant, show that they have cheerfully

[1] *New History*, p. 207. Another account, p. 346, assigns the funeral service to Mulla Muhammad Taki of Herat.

[2] *New History*, p. 235.

given the supreme proof of love in sacrificing their lives for their Lord. But in spite of the amazing growth of Bábism in the United States since 1893, what Christian theologian will recognise in their faith anything but folly or fraud?[1]

One more group of Gospel narratives needs some consideration. The Evangelists, wherever they may have written, lived in an atmosphere of belief in which various forms of disease were ascribed to possession by evil spirits.[2] The world was the scene of a vast conflict between superhuman powers. Multitudes of angels and demons filled rank after rank in the realms above and below. All nature was the field of their activity; and they waited upon man for good or ill. Over against the majesty of Heaven

[1] It is much to be lamented that these two categories are still the only alternatives offered to the enquirer who cannot accept the assumptions of orthodoxy. 'Faith in the Incarnation, with all that it involved,' says the Rev. J. R. Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, 1894, p. 199, 'has been the sole and exclusive source of our historic Christianity. Yet if Christ were merely man, this was precisely the one point, on which either He or His reporters were profoundly wrong. The case, therefore, is narrowed to a simple issue. Christianity cannot be due to the goodness and wisdom of a man, marred by a pardonable element of error; for it is simply and solely on the supposed element of error that it rests; and its missionaries and martyrs, its holy and humble men of heart . . . will have derived their inspiration either from folly or from fraud.' The psychology of religious imagination has yet to be studied on the lines laid down by Prof. W. James in his *Varieties of Religious Belief*. No sympathetic investigator will wish to apply harsh words to beliefs that are generated under the influence of exalted states of religious emotion. He will only require that the same treatment shall be applied to all. The conditions of mediæval faith have been examined by Dr. E. A. Abbott in the case of Thomas Becket.

[2] The fullest treatment of this subject will be found in Conybeare's essays on the 'Demonology of the N.T.' in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vols. viii. and ix. Shorter articles are included in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, and *Encycl. Bibl.*

lay the dark regions of the Abyss; and with the kingdom of God the forces of Satan were in unceasing war. In various forms this struggle between good and evil was incessant; it supplied a kind of frame-work for all human life; any individual might find himself involved in the great drama, and unwillingly dragged into the battle of opposing powers. From the deaf and dumb, the epileptic, and insane, up to the person of Messiah himself, whose death is brought about by 'the rulers of this age'[1]—the spiritual agencies of evil are always at work. To subdue them is part of Christ's proper function. Messiah's activity lies in their midst. Scene after scene depicts him as their vanquisher; they recognise his control and obey; they quit the hapless sufferer's body at his command; when they have stirred up the winds and waves to engulf the boat in which he lies asleep, at his rebuke they are 'muzzled' and there is a great calm.[2]

It has long been known that this order of beliefs was active in the early Church, where the rite of exorcism was regularly practised, and the general conception of the existence of demonic powers was

[1] 1 *Cor.* 2^{6-8}. From the second century onward this phrase has been repeatedly understood to refer to some high order of the demonic powers. The interpretation is not without difficulty; but has analogies elsewhere, e.g. 1 *Cor.* 15^{24}, *Rom.* 8^{38}, *Col.* 1^{16}, *Eph.* 1^{21}, 2^{2}, 3^{10}, etc., which contain allusions to hierarchies of angelic and diabolic agencies. Cp. Findlay in *Expositor's Greek Test.*, Drummond in *Internat. Handbooks to the N.T.*, vol. ii., and Weiss-Meyer, on the one hand: and on the other Holtzmann, *N.T. Theologie*, 1897, vol. ii. p. 239, and Schmiedel in *Hand-Commentar zum N.T.*

[2] See the parallels in *Mark* 1^{25-27} and 4^{39-41}; and cp. *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed., p. 193.

applied to explain the significance of the ancient gods of Greece and Rome. But the researches of the last thirty years have made it clear that it belongs to a stage of culture widely spread all round the globe.[1] The practice of Jesus as described by the First Three Evangelists may be connected by an unbroken chain with phenomena to be witnessed at the present day among the witch doctors of West Africa or the devil dancers of India.[2] The particular sources of Jewish demonology are to be found in the ancient ideas of Egypt, Babylon, and Persia, where magic and exorcism entered largely into the rites of religion. It is impossible, therefore, any longer to isolate the occurrences in the New Testament from the immense range of similar manifestations to which the history of the past and the observation of the present alike bear witness. If it is suggested that 'there are evil spirits, subjects of the Evil One, who, in the days of the Lord Himself and his Apostles especially, were permitted by God to exercise a direct influence over the souls and bodies of certain men,'[3] it may be replied that the saving word

[1] See the treatise on *Primitive Culture* by Dr. Tylor, and his article 'Demonology' in the 9th ed. of *Encycl. Brit.*

[2] See for instance Miss Kingsley's *West African Studies*, 2nd ed. chap. ix.; Caldwell, in the *Contemporary Review*, February, 1876, 'Demonolatry, Devil-dancing, and Demoniacal Possession.' In a curious and interesting work, *Demon Possession, and Allied Themes*, London, 1897, recording the observations of Dr. Nevius, for forty years a missionary in China, 1854-93, an abundant collection of modern instances is given from India, China, and Japan, with others from Europe and the United States. Dr. Nevius justifies the belief, and applies it directly to the explanation of the Gospel narratives.

[3] Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd ed. 1893, vol. i. pt. i., p. 753. Cp. W. Menzies Alexander, *Demonic Possession in the New Testament*, 1902: 'the

'especially' has no force in presence of the vast accumulation of evidence from the ages both before and after Christ; and the hypothesis of a peculiar outburst of demonic energy in the time of Jesus falls in complete collapse upon the ground.

What, then, was the attitude of Jesus himself to this conception. It is a question which the historical enquirer cannot evade. The testimony of the First Three Gospels is explicit. He uses the language and he performs the actions which the belief implies.[1] Does he do so by way of what is called 'accommodation?' Is he consciously adopting a popular idiom as the only way of putting himself into intelligible relations with the sufferers and their friends? There is no trace of such adaptation of his thought to theirs. On the contrary he frankly accepts the current view, and claims no more success himself than he is willing to admit in others. When the malignant charge is brought against him that he cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils, he refutes it not only by the general argument that if Satan is divided against himself his kingdom must fall, but by the retort *ad hominem*, 'Then by whom do your sons cast them out?[2] Therefore they shall be your judges.' Such a question could have but one meaning. Jesus plainly recognised the cures wrought by the dis-

incarnation initiated the establishment of the kingdom of heaven upon earth. That determined a counter movement among the powers of darkness. Genuine demonic possession was one of its manifestations.' *American Journal of Theology*, Jan. 1903, p. 148.

[1] For instance, *Mark* $1^{25\,34}$, 3^{15}, $5^{8\text{-}17}$, etc. [2] *Matt.* 12^{27}, *Luke* 11^{19}.

ciples of the Rabbis as no less effective than his own.

Can the modern student of the Gospels, however, remain in that position? To this question different answers have been given. Writing in 1894, the late Dr. G. J. Romanes expressed the dilemma thus:[1]

'Either the current theory was true or it was not. If you say true, you must allow that the same theory is true for all similar stages of culture, and therefore that the most successful exorcist is Science, albeit Science works not by faith in the theory, but by rejection of it. Observe the diseases are so well described by the record, that there is no possibility of mistaking them. Hence you must suppose that they were due to devils in A.D. 30, and to nervous disorders in A.D. 1894. On the other hand, if you choose the other horn, you must accept either the ignorance or the mendacity of Christ.'

Either of these latter alternatives, thought Romanes, might be admitted by Christianity. Is it surprising that his Editor should express his dissent?

'Romanes' line of argument seems to me impossible to maintain. The emphasis which Jesus Christ lays on diabolic agency is so great that, if it is not a reality, He must be regarded as seriously misled about realities which concern the spiritual life, or as seriously misleading others. And in neither case could He be even the perfect Prophet.'[2]

[1] *Thoughts on Religion*, 1895, p. 180-1, edited by Canon Gore.

[2] Another significant passage from the same distinguished writer is quoted by Conybeare, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. viii., p. 593: 'Our Lord's language reaches the level of positive teaching about good, and still more about bad, spirits.' Dr. Gore goes on to declare it to be 'impossible for Jesus as the incarnate Son of God, yet more as the spiritual teacher of mankind, to teach ignorantly on such a matter, or to inculcate false impressions about it, or to connive in regard to it at popular belief and language.' Compare the more guarded language of Prof. Sanday, in his article 'Jesus Christ,' Hastings'

Once more the presuppositions of faith tend control the result. But the issue has at last be clearly faced. Either the authority of Jesus suffic to establish the permanent reality of demor agency, or he was, in respect of that belief, as mu a man of his time as Peter or Paul.[1]

III.

This question is also forcing itself to the front i another connexion. Jesus bears the Greek desig nation 'Christ,' the equivalent of the Hebrew 'Mes siah' or 'Anointed.' It is in this character that he is at once recognised by the demons, and his war with them is one of the phases of his Messianic activity. It is in this character that he is acclaimed at Jerusalem on his solemn entry; it is in this character that he is condemned, and dies upon the cross. The identification of Jesus as Messiah is the aim of the Synoptic narratives, as it was also the theme of the apostolic preaching which preceded them. It set Jesus at once in the focus of the national hope; it made him the centre to which all kinds of popular expectation might attach themselves.

Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii., p. 624: 'His methods of healing went upon the assumption that they were fundamentally what every one, including the patients themselves, supposed them to be.' . . . . This 'assumption was part of the outfit of His incarnate Manhood. There was a certain circle of ideas which Jesus accepted in becoming Man in the same way in which he accepted a particular language with its grammar and vocabulary.'

[1] This was the idea that lay behind the well-known essays of Prof. Huxley; see *Science and Christian Tradition*, 1895.

This national hope was rooted in the distant past. It had sprung from the profound convictions of Israel's prophets concerning God's purpose for his people and for the world.[1] It had passed through many forms amid different political conditions, and it had found final expression within the limits of the Scriptures in the book of Daniel. There, in the visions which delineated the succession of tyrannies beneath which Israel had suffered, the believer saw the oppressions of old time pass away, and beheld 'the kingdom . . . given to the people of the saints of the Most High,' *Dan.* 7^{27}; and there, too, for the first time,[2] he found the promise of a resurrection, 'some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' That might be the last word of the Scriptures upon this great theme. But it was by no means the last word of expectation. The imagination of some of Israel's teachers was deeply stirred by the prospect thus opening before them; and a whole literature arose engaged with forecasts of the events to come. All time was divided into two great periods—the age that now is, and the age that is to be. The transition would be marked by portents and wonders; and the 'renovation' or 'renewal' would be ushered in by the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment which would admit the righteous to the blessed life. These were the 'last things,' whose study, under the Greek name of 'Eschatology,' has of late acquired

[1] See Lect. IV., *ante*, p. 211.

[2] On the date of *Daniel*, see *ante*, p. 171 ff.

the highest significance for the interpretation of the Gospels.[1] For here are the early forms of conceptions which are now deeply implanted in traditional Christianity. 'We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge,' sings the worshipper in the *Te Deum*; and in the Apostles' Creed he declares his faith in the words, 'He sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.' To this order of belief also belongs the expectation of 'the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.' What, then, is the place of these ideas in the teaching of Jesus; and what is their significance for our actual religion? These questions take us into the heart of the most difficult questions of Gospel study. It is impossible to discuss them here; it must be enough to point out what they are, and to urge that they shall not be evaded, but be frankly faced.

The language of the early Church recorded in the New Testament proves beyond doubt the character of its own hopes. As Jesus is taken up into the sky and a cloud receives him from the disciples' gaze, the visitants in white apparel promise his return, *Acts* 1^{11}:

> This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven.

[1] The principal English treatise on the subject since *The Jewish Messiah* of Dr. Drummond, 1877, is that of Dr. R. H. Charles, *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity*, 1899. See also the articles on the subject in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, and in *Encycl. Bibl.*; and the section in Schürer's *History of the Jewish People in the time of Christ*, II. ii. 126-187.

His function on returning is defined in language ascribed to the Apostle Paul at Athens, *Acts* 17^{31}:

God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained.

These expectations are confirmed by the language of the Apostle's own letters, as in 1 *Thess.* $4^{15\text{-}17}$:

This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming[1] of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord.[2]

All through the New Testament in various forms rings this great expectation; the world is passing away, it is the last age; and though, in one of the latest books, the mockers enquire 'Where is the promise of his coming?'[3] faith is still strong enough to bear delay; an opportunity of repentance must be given to all; but the final catastrophe is sure. The Apostle Paul founds his own trust on 'the word of the Lord.' Did this appeal to the authority of Christ rest on a claim to private and personal revelation, or on some teaching generally received in the Church as his? Both views have been taken: and it is unnecessary for us to decide as to the Apostle's source, because the language of the First Three Gospels is explicit.

[1] Greek *parousia*; Latin, *advent*. [2] Cp. *1 Cor.* $15^{51\text{-}52}$. [3] *2 Pet.* 3^{4}.

On three several occasions, according to the records, does Jesus announce the 'coming of the Son of Man' in the life-time of his hearers. At the most critical moment of his career, before his accusers and judges, he declares in emphatic language:

Matt. 26[64].	*Mark* 14[62].	*Luke* 22[69].
Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.	Ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven.	From henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God.

This does but repeat the prediction made in detail to the disciples on the Mount of Olives.[1] 'What shall be the sign of thy coming,' they enquired, 'and of the end of the world'?[2] The Teacher sketches a future of gloom and tribulation; wars, earthquakes, famines, among the nations; persecution and hatred for the preachers of the Gospel. When the 'abomination of desolation' is seen standing in the holy place, 'then let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains'; it will be the beginning of great tribulation. Hardly has the tribulation ended, when 'immediately,' says *Matt.* 24[29], the heavenly bodies shall be eclipsed, and mighty portents shall herald the arrival of the Son of Man:

[1] *Matt.* 24, *Mark* 13, *Luke* 21.

[2] So *Matt.* 24[3]; Mark and Luke are less definite.

Matt. 24[30-31].

And they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

Mark 13[26-27].

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory.

And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

Luke 21[27-28].

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.

But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh.

Is it asked when these great events may be expected? The language is as definite as words can make it: they will be accomplished in the life-time of his hearers: and the announcement is confirmed with solemn asseveration.

Matt. 24[33-34].

Even so ye also, when ye see these things, know that he [*or*, it] is nigh, *even* at the doors.

Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished.

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

Mark 13[29-30].

Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that he [*or*, it] is nigh, *even* at the doors.

Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished.

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

Luke 21[31-32].

Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh.

Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all things be accomplished.

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

And when the Son of Man arrived what would he do? The sequel of the discourse in *Matt.* $25^{31\text{-}46}$ describes the judgment-scene when the nations are gathered before the throne for the final award. No note of time marks it; but the language of *Matt.* $16^{27\text{-}28}$ leaves us in no doubt; the judgment was the natural sequel of the resurrection, just as the resurrection would immediately follow, as Paul taught, on the Advent.

> For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

Such is the witness of the Gospels. What does it mean? The first serious study of these utterances concerning the last things, the first recognition of their import in the development of the early Church, may be said to have proceeded from Prof. Colani of Strasburg forty years ago.[1] A whole generation of scholars has discussed the difficulties which they present. Every biographer of Jesus has had his own explanation. The reports of the several Evangelists have been scrutinised, and their occasional variations have been minutely noted. The composition of the great discourse on the Mount of Olives has been carefully analysed, with the result that many scholars believe it to embody fragments of a little Jewish apocalypse.[2] The extent of these

[1] In his treatise *Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps*, 1864.

[2] See Charles, *Critical History*, p. 328; Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 232; Moffatt, *Historical N.T.*, p. 294. Cp. *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed. pp. 247-9.

fragments is still under investigation; but they do not affect the main question. The evidence seems complete, according to the accepted identification of the term 'Son of Man' with Jesus, that 'the parousia was to be within the current generation.' Such is the judgment of Prof. Charles; and he continues, 'We must, accordingly, admit that this expectation of Christ was falsified.'[1]

Are we, however, shut up to that interpretation? Is it so certain, after all, that Jesus intended to predict his own return? Why does he always describe the future in terms of the advent of the 'Son of Man'? Why does he never say, 'Ye shall see *me* coming'? These questions open up perplexing inquiries. 'Again and again as we read these passages,' observes one of the most impartial of students,[2] 'the question involuntarily recurs to the mind, Can Jesus mean himself?' I have ventured to argue elsewhere that the 'invariable employment of the third person suggests that he intended to draw a clear distinction between himself and his own function, and the event which he designates by this emblematic name.'[3] In the mysterious vision described in *Daniel* 7, the coming of 'one like unto a son of man with clouds of heaven' denotes the establishment of the sovereignty of the holy people, in contrast with the bestial forms of the successive

[1] *Critical Hist.* p. 331. With his sequel we are not now concerned: 'But the error is not material. It is in reality inseparable from all true prophecy,' etc.

[2] Dr. Drummond, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1901, p. 566.

[3] *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed., p. 255.

empires beneath which Israel had suffered ; *they* rose out of the sea and passed away. May not Jesus have used the same symbol, with a similar meaning? May it not be that he designated the mighty change which should usher in the *palingenesía*, the great renewal of the earth and heaven,[1] by this solemn figure, so as to separate himself from it as far as possible, instead of making himself the centre round which all revolved? 'It is conceivable,' writes Dr. Drummond, 'that he may not have identified himself as Messiah with him who was to come as the conquering Son of Man, but may have understood the prophetic vision as a poetical description of the spiritual conquest of the world's brute forces by a divinely commissioned humanity, personified as the Son of Man.' The supposition is doubtless 'open to objection,' but the same critic cautiously adds that 'it seems to follow' from the facts already pointed out.[2]

In this view the passages which describe the 'coming' are regarded as essentially authentic. Their form may vary slightly in the different gospels, but in the main they represent the actual language of Jesus. Another school of critics, however, finds a way out along a different path. Accepting the traditional interpretation, they deny their genuineness. More than sixty years ago Bruno Bauer instituted a searching examination of the Gospel story,[3] with the startling issue that Jesus

[1] *Matt.* 19[28]. [2] *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, 1901, p. 568.
[3] *Kritik der Evangel. Gesch. der Synoptiken*, 3 vols. 1841-2.

never claimed the Messianic character at all. A similar result was reached by Havet in more recent times;[1] and, later still, it was one of the principal positions of Dr. Martineau in his treatment of the person of Jesus in the *Seat of Authority in Religion*, 1890. It has been advocated by Wellhausen, and supported by Lagarde.[2] Nor is it lacking champions to-day. Dr. Wrede (of Breslau), in a treatise on 'the Messianic Secret in the Gospels,' regards the presentation of Jesus as Messiah even by Mark as a reflexion back on to his earthly career of a function which really began with the resurrection.[3] It is one of the embarrassments of such a conception that it reduces so much of the narratives to uncertainty, and leaves the real aim of Jesus in obscurity and gloom. That is no serious objection to Dr. Wrede, who finds one of the chief obstacles to the supposition that Jesus accepted the title, in the impossibility of determining what he conceived it to mean. At present, however, it seems to be felt that the earlier dates now usually assigned to the First Three Gospels do not favour such a complete reconstruction of the traditions, and the view that Jesus repudiated the Messianic character creates more difficulties than it solves.

But this enquiry is after all only of subordinate importance to those who do not regard the cycle of Messianic ideas as an essential part of their religion.

[1] *Le Christianisme et ses Origines*, vol. iv. p. 15 ff.

[2] Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 2nd. ed., 1902, vol. i. p. 662.

[3] *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901, p. 228.

As we look at the forms in which they are presented to us in the New Testament, do we not see that they belong to a world conceived very differently from that which we know? A heaven to which Messiah can be taken up, and from which he can visibly descend,—a resurrection bringing the sleeping dead out of the ground—a judgment gathering all nations into the same scene for one great assize—a division of time into two ages, that which now is, and that which is to come, with all nature as a shuddering witness of the passage from one to the other—a future wherein the 'blessed' and the 'cursed' are hopelessly parted, and the latter become the 'everlasting' companions of the devil and his angels[1]—all these are the symbols of antique imagination to which our modern thought responds no more. We may employ them as the poetical expression of a great dramatic idea; but they have ceased to be true to fact. They belong to an interpretation of the universe which science has destroyed; and they imply a conception of life too narrow and limited for the infinite possibilities which it has disclosed. Tenable only on a theory which made the earth the central plane beneath the vault of heaven, they have been put to flight by the revelations of the telescope. To the mighty scale of space and time demanded by the knowledge of to-day they are altogether inadequate. They had their significance for their own age; they were the vehicle of something greater

[1] We cannot here enquire what may have been the meaning of the Greek adjective *æonian*.

than they knew. They supplied the forms which carried the ideas of Jesus far and wide, and even supported them till they could stand alone. But they are no less clearly stamped with the marks of local origin and temporary character than the theory of demoniacal possession. They are the product of national imagination, working on the sufferings of Israel, inspired by its hopes; but they cannot be made universal; and only that which is universal can permanently express man's faith in God.

Such are some of the conditions of the present study of the origins of Christianity so far as they are presented in the First Three Gospels. It has been impossible to do more than indicate the changes that have come over our conception of the problems to be solved, and the causes which have produced them. The student must judge for himself how far the new lines of enquiry are legitimate, and the new methods sound. The work is slow and full of difficulty; we are only just beginning to realize how slow, how difficult. The fragmentary character of the records renders a 'life' of Jesus in the ordinary biographical sense for ever unattainable: we cannot even determine beyond doubt the years of his birth or death.[1] Certainty about many of the incidents of his career is beyond our reach;

[1] Thus Keim dated his entrance into public life in the year 34 A.D. 'Nothing in the world is so certain as that Jesus, taking the widest limits of his labours, was at work solely and entirely between the years 33-35 of our reckoning,' *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. ii. p. 385. The crucifixion is afterwards assigned to 35, and his baptism to 34. Modern chronology inclines rather to 29.

and we must abandon the attempt in many things to know him as he was.

But the teaching of Jesus is not involved in the same obscurity. We can study his essential thoughts; to us, no less than to the first disciples, are his ideas full of light and strength. They are, in part, as we have seen, dependent on the intellectual conditions of their time; but in part they rise above the limitations of race or age into the realm of the eternal. How far can they be brought to bear on our own lives? How far can they be translated into other phases of experience? Such questions were implicitly asked at an early stage in the history of Christian life, and found their answer in the Fourth Gospel. A similar need besets us to-day. Our conceptions of the world have vastly changed, and our outlook is no longer that of the Teacher and the Twelve. Our knowledge has expanded in every direction. We survey our globe with its myriads of peoples in every stage of social development; we trace the age-long history of our race through perspectives of distance of which the writers of the ancient Scriptures never dreamed. On every hand the kingdom of science expands its mighty realm, and with bewildering speed and complexity immense accessions offer themselves on every hand. But we go back to the Gospels for the fresh impulses and the abiding trusts of our religion. There is the impersonation of the prophetic ideal, where faith and conduct support and confirm each other. Historically, it cannot be denied that Jesus is the ultimate

creator of the Christian character, the primal source of the Christian life. That character embodies the loftiest goodness that we know; that life is rooted deepest in the love of God and man. To live that life ourselves, to quicken it in others, to establish it as the guide of citizenship at home, and to carry it forth among the nations of the earth—this is the contribution which God calls upon each one of us to make towards that great purpose which philosophy may describe as the education of the race, but which religion will still designate the salvation of the world.

LECTURE VII.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE student of the Gospels is soon confronted by the differences between the First Three and the Fourth. That Synoptic view which unites Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is dissolved into new glories under the hand of John. Herder, as we have seen, was keenly conscious of the change, and described the Fourth Gospel as the 'echo of the older Gospels in a higher key.'[1] Even in the third century its peculiar character so impressed some of the teachers of the Church that they called it the 'pneumatic' or 'spiritual' Gospel. What is the secret of this character? In what manner does it express itself? What value is to be attached to the new forms of thought which it presents? How far can the record be connected with an actual follower of the Master? These are questions with which the investigations of the last decades have been closely occupied. Every lover of the Gospel desires answers to them. What answers are possible in the light of our present

[1] *Lect.* V., *ante*, p. 234.

knowledge? To expound them fully would require a treatise. But an attempt must be made, however inadequately, to indicate the movements of thought on this difficult and complicated theme.

I.

At the outset it must be observed that the whole story of the ministry of Jesus is set in a new frame both of time and place. The First Three Gospels apparently distribute his public activity into two unequal periods, the earlier occupied by his preaching in Galilee, the later by his journey to Jerusalem, the last days of teaching in the temple, his arrest and execution. The crisis dividing the two occurs in the retreat at Cæsarea Philippi beneath the slopes of Hermon. There Peter formally acknowledges Jesus as Messiah, and he, in his turn, announces to the disciples his purpose to make the great venture and proceed to the capital (*Mark* 8^{27-33}, *Matt.* 16^{13-23}, *Luke* 9^{18-22}). The passover at which he suffers is thus the only feast which he publicly attends. Assuming that if the Evangelists had known of earlier visits to Jerusalem at previous festivals, they would have recorded them, we may infer that they conceived his active career to have been embraced in the interval between the passover at which he suffered and the same feast twelve months before. It was thus all brought within a year, and this period was sometimes identified by

early Christian writers with 'the acceptable year of the Lord' (*Isai.* 61^{2}, *Luke* 4^{19}).

But the Fourth Gospel more than doubles this duration. Its chronological scheme appears to include at least three passovers (*John* $3^{13\ 23}$, 6^{4}, and 13^{1}), so that the ministry of Jesus extends over more than two years. An unnamed feast, 5^{1}, has even been identified with the passover by both ancient and modern scholars; and four passovers would thus include three years.[1]

The greater length thus assigned to Messiah's career naturally requires more incidents to fill it; and the scene of his teaching shifts time after time from south to north and back again. From the Jordan bank, 1^{28}, where Andrew already announces to Simon 'We have found the Messiah,' and Simon receives the name Cephas (or Peter), he passes (on the third day) to Cana of Galilee, 2^{1}; thence to Jerusalem for the passover, 2^{13}, and afterwards again to the neighbourhood of the Jordan, 3^{22}, where he, like John, baptized.[2] From there he travels through Samaria to Galilee, $4^{3\text{-}4\ 43}$, and once more, 5^{1}, goes up to Jerusalem. The 'persecution' which follows the cure of the impotent man on the Sabbath, 5^{16}, apparently drives him from the metropolis, and

[1] This view is now, however, generally abandoned. Westcott adopts the new year's festival of trumpets, in September; Weiss prefers Purim in March; and so H. Holtzmann under reserve; Dods, *Expositor's Greek Test.*, does not decide. The difficulty is significant.

[2] This is afterwards corrected, 4^{2}; but it is already implied in the language of Jesus to Nicodemus, 3^{5}, concerning birth 'of water and the spirit.' Wendt, *The Gospel according to St. John* (1902), p. 120, perceiving the incongruity, supposes that the words 'water and' have been editorially added.

after he has vindicated himself in a prolonged discourse, 5^{19-47}, he withdraws to 'the other side of the Sea of Galilee,' 6^{1}. A passover follows, which he does not attend, 6^{4}, sojourning in Galilee till the September festival of Tabernacles, 7^{1-2}, when he presents himself in the temple in the middle of the feast and teaches [14]. No return to Galilee is recorded; colloquy after colloquy follows in the capital; the next note of time is in December, three months later, at the feast of the Dedication, 10^{22}. Once more the hostility of the Jews compels his retirement, and he finds a refuge beyond Jordan in the scene of the first days where John had baptized, 10^{40}. The death of Lazarus brings him to Bethany, and the Sanhedrîn already determines on his death, 11^{45-53}. Again, therefore, he leaves the scene of danger, this time for the upland country near Bethel, north of Jerusalem.[1] The passover is once more at hand. But Jesus does not travel by the eastern route with a crowd of disciples (as in *Matt.* and *Mark*). There is no passage through Jericho; no Bartimæus sits by the wayside calling for mercy to the Son of David; no Zacchæus climbs a tree to see him pass. He reappears in the home of Mary and Martha at Bethany, and when Mary pours forth the precious ointment on him, he recognises it as a funeral rite, 12^{7}. The next day he rides in to Jerusalem and receives the welcome of the populace as 'king of Israel.' The story here coalesces with the Synoptic narrative, and the last days have arrived.

[1] 11^{54}; on the identification of Ephraim see Holtzmann *in loco*.

In a scheme so different it is inevitable that incidents which are common to the two types should be lodged at different places on the way. The anointing, for instance, is placed by Mark and Matthew in the house not of Lazarus but of Simon the leper, immediately before the passover, some days after his first appearance in the city. Two more conspicuous departures from prior records of tradition may be noted. The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem is followed in the First Three Gospels (either on the same day, *Matt.*, *Luke*, or the next day, *Mark*) by the expulsion of the traffickers from the temple. The daring act concentrates on him the hatred of the authorities, and is one of the prime causes of his subsequent arrest. The Fourth Gospel, however, assigns it to the *first* Passover, $3^{13\text{-}16}$, two years before, without, however, any of the aids of popular enthusiasm to support the Teacher who (as in the Synoptics) has just arrived with a large concourse of followers. Strangely enough, it rouses no opposition. No consequences ensue; and the act which in the earlier narratives really costs him his life, excites no notice which the biographer thinks it worth while to report. No student will now believe, with the elder harmonists, that the incident was really repeated. Those who accept the apostolic authorship may, with Prof. Sanday,[1] prefer the earlier date. Historical probability, however, pleads strongly for the later.[2]

[1] In Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 613.

[2] Bacon, *Introd. to the N.T.* (1900), supposes that the narrative in *John* has

Another highly significant instance is found in the divergences concerning the account of the last supper and the day on which Jesus died. The Synoptic narratives agree in representing the Master as 'eating the passover' with the disciples. They join together in the national celebration when the paschal lamb was slain and roasted for the festal meal: 'with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer,' *Luke* 22^{15}. But in the Fourth Gospel the parting supper takes place 'before the feast of the passover,' 13^{1}. The arrest follows the same night; early next morning his captors have still the passover before them, 18^{28}; and it is the 'preparation' day, $19^{14\,31}$. Jesus, in fact, dies about the hour when the paschal lamb is slain. He is mysteriously identified with it by the application to him of the Levitical rubric that no bone of it should be broken, 19^{36} cp. *Exod.* 12^{46};[1] and the narrative thus rests on the idea expressed by Paul, 'Our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ,' 1 *Cor.* 5^{7}. No one now seriously attempts to conciliate these two dates[2]; but opinion naturally varies as to the more probable, and critics of opposite schools such as the late Bishop Westcott

been misplaced, and really belongs to the last days. See his note, p. 273, and his general argument concerning frequent disarrangements of material. Another distinguished American scholar once told me that he believed all three Johannine passovers to be the same.

[1] Others suggest an allusion to a free Greek rendering of *Psalm* 34^{20}.

[2] At least, with our present texts. For instance, the problem is abandoned by Sanday, Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 634; and by Dods, *Expositor's Greek Test.*, vol. i. p. 814.

and Dr. Sanday on the one side, and Dr. Abbott and Prof. Bacon on the other, unite in preferring the Johannine view.[1]

When the record of external events thus differs, it is not surprising that the presentment of the Teacher's word and work should differ also. Here is no preaching of 'the Gospel.'[2] The 'kingdom of God,' the theme of so many parables and sayings in the Synoptic ministry, is named only in the conversation with Nicodemus, *John* $3^{3\,5}$. No call to repentance awakens the guilty conscience; no promise of forgiveness kindles the sinner's hope. In place of these great ideas which play so important a part in the Synoptic records, the Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as describing himself in figures, 'I am the door, the good shepherd, the vine;' or deals with high abstract conceptions, with symbols and emblems, arranged in pairs of opposites, God being set over against the world, truth against falsehood, light against darkness, love against hatred, and life against death. From these summits of thought the Teacher speaks, no longer on the common things of homely interest, in short pregnant sayings where a phrase frequently contains a picture, or in the brief tales where some simple in-

[1] Bacon's argument, *Introd.* p. 267, that Paul's comparison would be very strange if the event had taken place a day after the paschal rite, seems to attribute an exactness of thought to the Apostle which is not prominent in some of his other analogies. More weight attaches to Dr. Abbott's remarks, *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. x. p. 828. Westcott, *Introd. to the Study of the Gospels*, 6th ed, 1881, p. 344, decided for the Johannine date, and endeavoured to reconcile the Synoptists with it.

[2] Cp. *Mk.* $1^{14\text{-}15}$, *Matt.* 4^{23}, 9^{35}.

cidents bring types of character into clear relief, but often in sustained discourse, sometimes so closely linked with the writer's comment or continuation, that it is hard to tell where the speaker ends and the expositor begins.[1] To the farewell address at the last supper, *John* 14-16, with the prayer which follows in 17, no parallel exists in the Synoptics. The groups of sayings aggregated in *Matthew's* sermon on the Mount are obviously collected out of smaller clusters, as the different distribution of much of the material in *Luke* sufficiently proves. But the discourse in which Jesus prepares the disciples for his departure, is bound together by certain common ideas, and although a close seems to be reached in 14^{31}, it is hard to believe that chapters 15-16 ever occupied any other position than the place where they now stand.[2] Yet how unlike is this utterance to the brief colloquies of the First Three narratives, and especially to that strange irony (*Luke* 22^{36}) with which the Master, foreseeing the tragic issue of the night, recommended the disciple without purse to sell his cloak and buy a sword!

Once more, the crises of the story have all changed. Unlike the Christ of the Synoptics, who,

[1] There are, of course, terse utterances of the synoptic type; but the characteristic style is found rather in the development of ideas and principles somewhat after the fashion of a composer working out a musical theme.

[2] Bacon proposes to insert these chapters after 13^{20}; Spitta after 13^{30}; and Wendt after 13^{35} (*Gospel*, etc., p. 103-4). But this last arrangement shatters the connexion of Peter's question in ^{36} with Christ's announcement of his departure to a place where he could not be followed in ^{33}. What meaning could the question have after 16^{28-29}? and who does not see a sublime close (perhaps the most wonderful in sacred literature) in 16^{32-33}?

in the earliest form of the traditions, receives no recognition as Messiah even from his own disciples till the question is plainly put to them at Caesarea Philippi 'Who say ye that I am?',[1] the Johannine Jesus is attested by the Baptist and accepted in that character from the outset. Andrew reports to Simon 'We have found the Messiah,' 1^{41}; Philip perceives in him the fulfilment of prophetic hopes, and Nathanael hails him as 'King of Israel,' 1^{49}. To the Samaritan woman Jesus declares his dignity, 4^{26}; and the townsmen believe in him as 'indeed the Saviour of the world,' 4^{42}. To fulfil the Father's will he has himself come down from heaven, 6^{38}; and authority has been given to him to execute judgment, 5^{27}, and raise up the believer at the last day, 6^{40}. Viewed as the Son of God before mortal birth, he needed no heavenly voice at the baptism to assure him of his august parentage, and these incidents therefore are not reproduced; while the descent of the Spirit which in earlier traditions was the emblem of Messianic unction, is converted into a sign for the Baptist, $1^{32\text{-}33}$. In the consciousness of the heavenly Son, there can be no place for struggle, and no temptation arrests him at the outset; nor can he whose meat it was to do the Father's will, feel any conflict even in the face of Death; and accordingly with the rebukes to Satan in the wilderness there vanishes also the prayer beneath the olives of Gethsemane. Instead of those glimpses of the victory of the willing spirit over the feeble flesh, which has ever since sustained

[1] See *ante*, Lect VI., p. 330.

the strength of the weary or despairing disciple,[1] the figure of Jesus stands with majestic calm, and a Roman cohort of six hundred men falls prostrate before him as he declares who he is, 18^{5-6}. Before Pilate he breaks the Synoptic silence by the announcement that he was born to bear witness of the truth, 18^{37}; and on the cross he proclaims the achievement of the heavenly purpose. When he can say 'it is finished,' 19^{30}, the work given him to do is ended, and he may re-enter the glory of the eternal home, 17^{4-5}. No greater contrast can be conceived to the appalling cry, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!'

Do the First Three Gospels and the Fourth really depict the same person? In the language of the Dean of Westminster,[2] 'We are constrained to ask, can both these representations be historically true? or is the one the simple and natural story of the facts, and the other the poetic creation of an ideal life of Christ?'

II.

The twentieth century is not the first to put these questions. They were asked in this country as long ago as 1792, by Edward Evanson, ex-vicar of Tewkesbury, in a remarkable little volume published at Ipswich under the title of *The Dissonance of the Four Generally Received Evangelists, and the*

[1] On 12^{27} cp. Dr. Abbott, *Enc. Brit.* vol. x. p. 827.

[2] Dr. Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels* (1902), p. 137.

Evidence of their Respective Authenticity examined.[1] The comparative study of the Gospels was then in its infancy, and Evanson worked as a pioneer. 'Unconnected for above fifteen years with any religious sect or party whatsoever' (so he wrote in his preface), 'disdaining the office of teacher of so plain a thing as Christianity considered as a lucrative occupation, and too far advanced in life to have any temporal interest in view, the author trusts his mind has been perfectly unbiassed and impartial in its investigations.' The results were sufficiently startling. The Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse could not proceed from the same author. And the contrasts between *John* and *Matthew* concerning the representations of the Baptist and the first disciples, or between *John* and *Luke* in the account of the last Supper, were highly unfavourable to the assumption of apostolic authorship. No less so was the emphatic recognition of the Messianic character of Jesus from the outset of his ministry; while it was curiously argued from the use of the Latin word *flagellum* 'barbarously written in Greek characters' (*phragellion*, 'scourge,' *John* 2^{15},) that the writer could not have lived till after the beginning of the second century.[2] Soon after 1800, voices of doubt began

[1] The author had been prosecuted for heresy in 1771,—the prosecution failed on technical grounds in 1775—but the principal inhabitants of Tewkesbury subscribed to pay their vicar's costs. He afterwards resigned his living in 1778.

[2] Into this period there also fell *Matthew* and *Mark* (*Luke* alone being saved as authentic history), the Pauline letters to the *Romans*, *Ephesians*, and *Colossians*, *Hebrews*, and the Catholic Epistles, *James*, *Peter*, *John*, and *Jude*.

to be raised in Germany,[1] which reached their fullest expression in the famous *Probabilia* of Dr. Bretschneider in 1820.[2] In spite of the fact that two years later he declared in the preface to the second edition of his *Dogmatik* that he himself adhered to the Johannine origin of the Gospel, and had only stated the case against it to secure a more vigorous defence,[3] his book proved the starting-point of all subsequent investigation. It supplied a basis for Strauss. The great argument of Baur[4] was wrought out with his usual independence, but Bretschneider had prepared the way. Nearly a quarter of a century later Keim[5] modified the extreme Tübingen position by carrying the Gospel back into the reign of Trajan, and placing it between the years 100 and 117 A.D. Yet he would have no compromise with intermediate views like that which Weizsäcker had announced three years before,[6] in ascribing it to a redaction by a disciple founded on memories of apostolic teaching at Ephesus. The spell of Baur's analysis was too potent. So radical a transformation of the life and teaching of Jesus could not be attributed even in a secondary sense to a companion of the Teacher from Nazareth.

[1] Cp. Reuss, *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*, transl. Houghton, 1884.

[2] See *ante*, Lect. V., p. 267.

[3] *Encycl. Brit.* vol. iv. (1875), p. 262.

[4] See *ante*, Lect. V., p. 268.

[5] In the first vol. of his *Geschichte Jesu*, 1867: Engl. transl., vol. i., pp. 141-232.

[6] *Untersuchungen*, 1864; see his later position in the *Apostolic Age*, vol ii.

The Tübingen criticism at first attracted little attention in this country. A few students here and there had, indeed, been powerfully affected by it. The main principles of its conception of the early development of Christianity had been expounded by the Rev. James Martineau in an article on Hippolytus ;[1] and it lay at the back of his criticism of Renan's Life of Jesus in 1863. But it was his colleague, the Rev. John James Tayler,[2] who opened the serious discussion of the whole Johannine question to English readers in 1867 by the publication of his *Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel, especially in its Relation to the Three First.* Mr. Tayler dwelt on the discrepancies between the Gospel and the book of Revelation, which could not, he urged, proceed from the same hand. But the attestation of antiquity was much stronger for the Apocalypse than for the Gospel ; the martyr Justin, for example, expressly attributing the first to the apostle, and never naming the second. The contrast between the main conceptions of the Synoptic writers and those of 'John' proved that the latter must be long posterior in date. The doctrine of the Logos or 'Word' was unknown to Paul, and the controversies in which the Apostle had pleaded the cause of the Gentiles were all hushed to rest. The access of non-Jews to the saving knowledge was welcomed, and in the vehement repudiation of the law and the

[1] 'Creed and Heresies of Early Christianity,' 1853, reprinted in *Studies of Christianity*, 1858.

[2] Principal of Manchester New College, London.

prophets—'all that ever came before me are thieves and robbers'—there were signs of a final and decisive breach with Judaism. For this no period seemed so fitting as the cruel persecution of Christians by Jews under Bar-Kochba, from which they were delivered by the collapse of his revolt and the second destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 135. To the decades following that year, therefore, between 135 and 160, the Gospel might be probably assigned. In guarded language Mr. Tayler finally pointed to the Second and Third Letters, both of which were written in the name not of an Apostle but of a Presbyter or 'Elder.' Of such a Presbyter John there were traditions in the church at Ephesus.[1] Eusebius had even asked whether the Apocalypse might not have proceeded from him. There was another alternative. The Presbyter John might have written the Gospel.[2]

Thus was the Tübingen criticism fairly launched in this country. No student of the history of the discussion will fail to recognise (with Bishop Lightfoot) the transparent sincerity of the investigation just summarised. Recent enquiry has, indeed, moved away from its results, though some of them do not lack active champions at the present day; Dr. Abbott still pleading that the Fourth Gospel was not known to Justin (145-149 A.D.), and Schmiedel

[1] See the testimony of Papias below.

[2] This suggestion made some years before by M. Nicolas, was fiercely condemned by Keim, *Jesus of Nasara*, i. 227. It has been recently defended by Harnack; see below.

and Pfleiderer finding in *John* 5^{43}—'if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive'—a probable allusion to Bar-Kochba's claim to be Messiah.[1] For a time, however, there seemed little alternative between the recognition of apostolic authorship on the one hand, and a date verging towards the middle of the second century on the other. The first was advocated by the great Anglican scholars Dr. Lightfoot[2] and Dr. Westcott,[3] to whose representative position Dr. Sanday[4] by right succeeds. The counter view found its advocates in Dr. Samuel Davidson, the author of *Supernatural Religion*, Matthew Arnold—who thought it possible by pure literary judgments to isolate specific sayings as undoubtedly authentic,[5] a method which severer critics do not sanction,—and Dr Martineau.[6] How does the controversy stand to-day? Is it possible in a few paragraphs to indicate its leading aspects? An attempt must at least be made to display to the general reader the nature of the evidence on which different judgments rest.

At the outset it may be noted that there is a practically unanimous consent that the author of the

[1] Schmiedel in *Encycl. Bibl.* ii. 2551; Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 2nd ed. 1902, vol. ii., p. 440. Pfleiderer adds 11^{48} and 16^{2} as probable references to the situation created by the second Jewish war.

[2] See the lectures from 1871 onwards collected in *Biblical Essays*, 1893.

[3] *The Gospel according to St. John* in the Speaker's Commentary, 1881.

[4] *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1872; *Inspiration*, 1893; and various essays and articles since.

[5] *God and the Bible*, chaps. v. and vi.

[6] *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, 1890, pp. 189-242.

Fourth Gospel was acquainted with the First Three. The narratives which they have in common, such as the feeding of the five thousand, the entry into Jerusalem, or some of the scenes of the Passion, are marked by traits of correspondence or correction which show that the writer used the Synoptic records in some one of their possible stages. A single instance must suffice. The story of the anointing of Jesus, placed by *Mark* and *Matthew* just before the Passover, is attached in *John* 12^{1-12} to the eve of his public entry into Jerusalem. Moreover, it is transferred from the house of Simon the leper to that of Lazarus and his sisters. But it is the same story; the costly ointment, the disciples' anger at 'this waste,' the suggestion that its value—three hundred pence—should have been given to the poor, these are all there; and the final justification of the devout and loving act, 'The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always,' coincides verbally with *Matt.* 26^{11}, cp. *Mark* 14^{7}. What place, then, is there for *Luke*, who relates a very different incident, 7^{37-38}? The reader who compares *John* with *Matthew* and *Mark* will notice that whereas they describe the ointment as poured upon the head of Jesus, the Fourth Gospel states that Mary anointed his *feet*. What is the source of this variation? *John* 12^{3} further mentions that she wiped his feet with her hair. Why should the ointment, as soon as it was laid on, be removed? The action was that of *Luke's* penitent, who 'began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with

the hair of her head.' Only when they had first been washed did she anoint them, with silent rebuke for the neglect of a discourteous host. The incident has been transferred to a setting no longer appropriate for it, and the story of the Fourth Gospel thus rests on the First Three.

The movement of modern investigation which has thus brought the Synoptic records within an earlier range,[1] opens fresh possibilities, at least so far as they are concerned, for the date of the Johannine books. For, in fact, the Gospel cannot be considered by itself alone. A large majority of critics concur in believing that the First Letter issues from the same pen. Whether a little earlier or a little later—opinions are divided—it represents the same modes of thought, and any evidence for the use of the Letter will imply that the Gospel cannot be far away. A careful distinction must be drawn between indications of the existence of a document, and its recognition as of apostolic authorship. But while it is well known that the Gospel is not formally attributed to the apostle John till the last quarter of the second century, there are, in the judgment of many of the best critics, clear traces of the Johannine literature more than fifty years before. The letter to the Church at Philippi, ascribed to Polycarp of Smyrna, inviting information about Ignatius of Antioch and his companions who had passed through Philippi on their way to Rome, was apparently written after the martyrdom of

[1] See *Lect.* VI. *ante*, p. 340.

Ignatius.[1] Is the letter authentic? It has been abundantly discussed, and the author of *Supernatural Religion* still thinks[2] that 'the preponderance of opinion assigns it to a much later period.' It will hardly, however, be thought too bold now to accept the judgment in its favour by Lightfoot[3] and Harnack,[4] the latter of whom places Polycarp's letter in the last years of Trajan, 110-117 A.D. (with a possible alternative of a few years later, 117-125). Now this letter contains numerous parallels with passages in the New Testament, for instance with the language of the Sermon on the Mount, and the letters bearing the names both of Peter and Paul. No New Testament writing, however, is anywhere cited by name. Among these parallels occurs the following :—

Ep. of Polycarp, 7.

'Everyone that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is Antichrist: and everyone that confesseth not the testimony of the cross, is of the devil.'

First Ep. of John, $4^{2,3}$.

Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the Antichrist.

Second Ep. of John, 7.

Many deceivers are gone forth into the world, *even* they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the Antichrist.

[1] The date of this event is variously placed between 110 and 115.

[2] Ed. 1902, p. 175.

[3] *Essays on Supernat. Rel.*

[4] *Chronol. der Altchristl. Literatur.* vol. i., 1897, pp. 382-406.

Have we here a positive reminiscence of the Johannine language, or only a reproduction of the vaguer sayings of a common school of early Christian thought? It may well be conceded that the opposition to the rising Docetic interpretation of the person of Jesus, which asserted in various forms that his bodily life was not real, would formulate itself on the lips of different teachers in almost the same terms, especially in a group of churches united by near neighbourhood and community of tradition. On the other hand the usage of the writer must also be considered; the traces of his acquaintance with other documents afterwards acknowledged by the Church must be examined; and the indications derived from any cases of apparent familiarity with language which—unlike the Gospel traditions—had nothing but a written source (such as the letters of Paul), must be carefully weighed. No one will accuse Harnack, who declares the non-apostolic character of the Fourth Gospel to be an 'incontrovertible result,' of bias in its favour in such an estimate as has just been described. Yet he has no hesitation in declaring that Polycarp borrowed from the First Epistle of John.[1] If this be admitted, a presumption is established that the Gospel, also, was in existence early in the century.[2]

A similar line of argument has been recently

[1] *Chronol.* i., pp. 385, 658.

[2] Harnack fixed the *terminus ad quem* at about 110 A.D. Moffatt, *Historical New Testament*, suggests 115. Jülicher, *Einleit. in das N.T.* (1901), p. 317, 100 to 110.

employed by Dr. Drummond to show that the Gospel was quoted by the Gnostic teacher Basilides. While Baur was elaborating his great essay on the Johannine Gospel, one of the curators of the National Library in Paris was examining a Greek manuscript brought from Mount Athos in 1842. It was printed for the first time at Oxford in 1851 under the name of Origen, but was immediately recognised by Jacobi and Bunsen as a lost 'Refutation of all Heresies'—such was its title—ascribed in the fourth century to Hippolytus of Rome, who wrote early in the third. That view has finally established itself above all rivals, and though the incidents of the relations of Hippolytus to his contemporaries are still obscure, the authorship of the treatise is no longer contested. In dealing with the Gnostic heretics, Hippolytus gives an account of the views of Basilides of Alexandria, who flourished in the reign of Hadrian, 117-138 A.D. In this exposition occurs the following passage[1]:

'And this, says he, is what is called in the Gospels, "That was the true light that lighteth every man who cometh (or, coming [*i.e.* the true light . . . coming]) into the world."'

That this is a quotation from the prologue of the Fourth Gospel is indisputable. But the question is, who makes it? Who is the subject of 'says he'? The answer depends on delicate considerations founded on the usage of Hippolytus in his citations. Does he present the collective opinion of a school, or produce a real extract from a specific writer,

[1] *Refutation*, vii. 22.

and, if the latter, was the writer Basilides himself? The elaborate investigations of Dr. Drummond cannot be summarised here[1]; it must suffice to record his cautious conclusion; 'on a survey of the whole case, I think the evidence renders it highly probable that the writer quoted by Hippolytus is Basilides himself.'[2] We are thus again brought to a date for the Gospel not later than the neighbourhood of 115 A.D.

Such illustrations might easily be multiplied in later decades. Did the martyr Justin, who cites the Book of Revelation as the Apostle's, know the Gospel also? Once more, the judgment of experts disagrees, but the grounds of divergence are not the same as in the last case. No one doubts that in the extract quoted by Hippolytus the Gospel is actually cited; but the question is, by whom? In the passages in Justin the inexactness of the language gives rise to the suggestion that he may be reproducing some independent tradition. The evidence, however interesting from the point of view of Justin's own handling of the doctrine of the Word, and his general use of the Gospels, does not really bear on the date of the book, if the instances already adduced are accepted as proofs of its existence.[3] A word

[1] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1892, part ii. 'Is Basilides quoted in the Philosophumena?'

[2] Lightfoot felt justified in saying with greater emphasis, 'The extreme probability that we have in the *Refutation* the very words of Basilides himself falls little short of demonstration,' *Biblical Essays*, 110.

[3] The case *for* is argued by Dr. Drummond in the *Theological Review*, April and July, 1877; *against*, by Dr. Abbott, *Modern Review*, 1882, pp. 558, 716.

must be said, however, on another item of evidence, with respect not to its first literary traces, but its actual authorship. Once more, the attempt to simplify the complicated nexus of facts involves large omissions, and it is only possible to sketch them in bare outlines.[1]

III.

At the end of the second century and the opening of the third a widespread tradition in Asia Minor, in Egypt, in North Africa, in Rome, ascribes the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John, brother of James, and son of Zebedee. The earliest witness to the sources of this tradition is Irenæus, writing at Lyons (in France) about 180 A.D. concerning the persons he had known in his youth in Asia Minor. Further evidence is derived from Papias of Hierapolis,[2] in Phrygia, whom Irenæus appears to quote. Their testimony is to the following effect.

Writing to a presbyter at Rome, named Florinus, who had fallen into heresy,[3] Irenæus reminds him of the early days in Lower Asia when he had been acquainted with Polycarp, and Irenæus himself was still a boy:—

[1] Students will of course refer to the *Biblical Essays* of Lightfoot, with the Essays of Dr. Ezra Abbot and Dr. A. P. Peabody, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1892.

[2] In his much discussed *Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord*, which Lightfoot placed 'towards the middle of the second century, not before 130 to 140,' and Harnack with fresh evidence dates between 140 (145) and 160, *Chronol.* i. p. 357.

[3] The letter is cited by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 20. I borrow the translation of Dr. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 55.

'I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received in childhood, growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people; and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And what were the accounts he had from them about the Lord, and about his miracles, and about his teaching; how Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, used to give an account harmonising on all points with the Scriptures. To these (discourses) I used to listen at the time with attention by God's mercy which was bestowed upon me, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and by the grace of God, I constantly ruminate upon them faithfully.'

It is unaminously agreed that in speaking of 'John' in this passage Irenæus means the Apostle, as he elsewhere mentions that Polycarp had followed a certain Easter observance with 'John the disciple of our Lord and the rest of the Apostles with whom he associated.'[1] And after speaking of our First Three Gospels he adds, 'John, the disciple of the Lord, who had also leaned upon his breast, himself published a gospel during his residence in Asia.'[2] It is, then, *inferred* that Irenæus might have received this information from Polycarp.

Along a different line the Gospel is connected with 'John the disciple of the Lord' through Papias. In the following passage Irenæus recites the testimony

[1] Letter to Victor, cited by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24. See another passage quoted below.

[2] Irenæus, *Against Heresies*, iii. 1. 1.

of the Elders,[1] where elements of Synoptic teaching are blended with the language of the Fourth Gospel, and the whole is crowned with a quotation from Paul:—

'As the elders say, then also shall they which have been deemed worthy of the abode in heaven go thither, while others shall enjoy "the delight of paradise," and others again shall possess the brightness of the city (i.e., the New Jerusalem); for in every place the Saviour shall be seen, according as they shall be worthy who see him. (They say) moreover that this is the meaning of the distinction between the habitation of them that bring forth a hundred-fold; and them that bring forth sixty-fold, and them that bring forth thirty-fold; of whom the first shall be taken up into the heavens, and the second shall dwell in paradise, and the third shall inherit the city; and that therefore our Lord has said, "In my Father's abode are many mansions"; for all things are of God, who giveth to all their appropriate dwelling, according as his Word saith that allotment is made unto all by the Father, according as each man is, or shall be, worthy. And this is the banqueting-table, at which those are seated who are called to the marriage and take part in the feast. The Elders, the disciples of the Apostles, say that this is the arrangement and disposal of them that are saved, and that they advance by such stages, and ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, the Son at length yielding his work to the Father, as it is said also by the Apostle "For he must reign until he putteth all enemies under his feet, etc."'

It is generally supposed that in this passage the words 'In my Father's abode are many mansions' contain an allusion to *John* 14[2]. Who, however, are 'the Elders,' and from what source does Irenæus derive their witness? Critics of different schools[2]

[1] *Against Heresies*, v. 36, 1-2; I again quote the rendering of Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 60.

[2] For instance, Lightfoot, Dr. Drummond, and Prof. Harnack.

concur in tracing it to the formal citation (in a passage immediately proceeding, 33, 4) of 'Papias a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, in his fourth book.' This John has been designated just before as 'the disciple of the Lord' (33, 3). It is apparently the same John who is again specified (35,2) as the author of the Apocalypse, 'John, the Lord's disciple, says that the new Jerusalem above shall descend, as a bride adorned for her husband.' And 'John' once more (36, 3), at the close of the passage already transcribed, is said to have clearly foreseen 'the first resurrection of the just, and the inheritance in the kingdom of earth.' The saying, therefore, 'in my Father's abode are many mansions,' may be ascribed with great probability to John the disciple of the Lord, who is thus identified according to Papias with both books, the Revelation and the Gospel. But was that John also the son of Zebedee? Let Papias again testify in words cited by the historian Eusebius[1]:—

'But I will not scruple also to give a place for you along with my interpretations to everything that I learnt carefully and remembered carefully in time past from the elders, guaranteeing their truth. For, unlike the many, I did not take pleasure in those who have so very much to say, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who relate foreign commandments, but in those [who record] such as were given from the Lord to the Faith, and are derived from the Truth itself. And again, on any occasion when a person came [in my way] who had been a follower of the elders, I would inquire about the discourses of the elders—what was said by Andrew, or by Peter, or by Philip, or by Thomas or James, or by John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39. The translation is again that of Lightfoot.

disciples, and what Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that I could get so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterings of a living and abiding voice.'

In spite of the effort of Dr. Salmon[1] to prove that Papias knew of but one John,[2] and that the repeated occurrences of the name in this passage denote the same person, most readers will probably adopt the view of Eusebius that they cannot be identified. Already in the fourth century tradition showed two tombs for the two teachers, and though the figures of the Apostle and the Elder are difficult to distinguish through the haze of reminiscence, yet there seems no adequate reason for denying their separate existence. It has, however, been argued[3] that the tradition that the Apostle lived on at Ephesus till the beginning of the reign of Trajan, rests on an error; and this view has recently received the powerful support of Harnack.[4] That this should be even possible within reasonable limits is a sufficient indication of the confused state of the evidence.[5] And the attestations of Papias and Irenæus, such as they are, receive a further shock when the contents of the traditions on which they rely are more closely examined. To 'John, the

[1] In Smith-Wace's *Dict. of Christian Biogr.* iii. p. 400.

[2] He does not claim personal acquaintance with the Apostle, though Eusebius asserts that he did call himself a hearer of the Elder John, iii. 39, 6.

[3] For instance, by Keim, Holtzmann, Scholten, and others.

[4] *Chronol.* i. 674. It is also expounded by Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.* ii. 2509, who adopts a view of the martyrdom of the Apostle which Harnack disallows, *Chronol.* i. 666.

[5] Harnack finally ascribes both Gospel and Apocalypse to the Elder John.

disciple of the Lord,' Papias expressly attributes (through the elders who related what they had heard from him) a prophecy of the Lord concerning wondrous vines 'each having ten thousand branches, and in each branch ten thousand twigs, and in each twig ten thousand shoots, and in each shoot ten thousand clusters, and on each cluster ten thousand grapes.'[1] To the same authority does Irenæus appeal in support of his remarkable conclusion that the teaching ministry of Jesus lasted nearly twenty years.[2] This view is founded on the statements of *Luke* 3^{23} and *John* 8^{57}. According to the first, Jesus was in his thirtieth year when he came to be baptised; according to the second, in the last twelvemonth of his life he was not yet fifty years old. This language was appropriate to one who had passed forty and was not far from completing another decade; but it was unreasonable to suppose that the Jews were mistaken by twenty years. Accordingly, after arguing on general grounds that he who was to save all must himself have passed through every stage of life, must have been a child for children and an old man for old men, Irenæus invokes the testimony of the apostle John and the elders of Asia against the heretics who wished to limit his public career to one year:—

'From the fortieth and fiftieth year a man begins to decline towards old age, in which condition our Lord continued teaching,

[1] Irenæus, *Against Heresies*, v. 33, 3. On the real source of this prophecy in the Apocalypse of Baruch, and the growth of the whole story of the incredulity of Judas, see *The First Three Gospels*, ed. 2, p. 133.

[2] *Against Heresies*, ii. 22, 5-6.

as the gospel and all the elders who were conversant in Asia with John the disciple of the Lord, testify that John had handed down these things. For he remained among them up to the times of Trajan. Some of them, moreover, saw not only John, but other apostles also, and heard the very same account from them, and bear testimony concerning this report. Whom then should we rather believe? Such men as these, or Ptolemæus, who never saw any apostles?'

'Whom should we rather believe'? It is a weighty question, but the emphatic witness of Papias and Irenæus to such incongruous statements does not encourage too great reliance on other items of their evidence.[1] The conflict seems to be irreducible. Writing in 1872, Dr. Sanday could state the difficulty in the following terms[2]:—

'The subject of the external evidence has been pretty well fought out. The opposing parties are probably as near to an agreement as they ever will be. It will hardly be an unfair statement of the case for those who reject the Johannean authorship of

[1] In this respect, however, we are properly reminded that there are degrees of value in testimony, cp. Drummond, *Remarks on the Art of Criticism in its application to Theological Questions*, 1902, p. 16. The description by Irenæus of his youthful impressions of the appearance of his revered teacher, Polycarp, is first-hand evidence which cannot be rejected. The report of Polycarp's intercourse with the Apostle John comes next in rank; for Irenæus *might* at a distance of many years have confused another John with the Apostle. The statement about the duration of the teaching-ministry of Jesus is evidently partly founded in the mind of Irenæus on his *interpretation* of *John* 8^{57}. But he appears to me clearly to assert that it was also derived from the elders who had personally received it from John, and not from John only but from other apostles also. That is to say, there was a link of one generation of testimony between Irenæus and John in this field, just as in the case of Polycarp. On the other hand, there was more risk of error in the transmission of a report about the matter of John's teaching, than in the transmission of the fact that it was a particular John who taught, just as the unnamed 'elders' have less precision than the venerated Polycarp.

[2] *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 3.

the Gospel to say that the external evidence is compatible with that supposition. And on the other hand, we may equally say for those who accept the Johannean authorship, that the external evidence would not be sufficient alone to prove it.'

After an interval of thirty years criticism speaks more definitely :[1]

'Those who defend the traditional authorship of the Gospel rely upon the strength of the second-century evidence in its favour, and endeavour to show that the internal evidence of the Gospel is not unfavourable to it. On the other hand . . . . it must be admitted that in ignorance of the tradition, no modern scholar would be likely to ascribe the Gospel in its present form to one of the twelve Apostles.'

In this dilemma we are again thrown back on the Gospel itself, and our judgment of its historical value must be determined mainly by comparing it with the preceding Three. In this respect there has been among recent writers a marked movement away from the older tradition. That the author was acquainted with the localities of Palestine[2] and the customs of Israel, that his use of the Greek language implies that he was himself a Jew, for his idiom is of a Hebrew rather than a Hellenic type, is, indeed, freely recognised in all schools. But this does not establish his identity with an apostle. How far the graphic touches of his narratives indicate the presence of an eye-witness, will naturally be decided differently according to the general impressions formed on other grounds. In these general im-

[1] 'Modern Criticism and the New Testament,' by Rev. W. C. Allen in *Contentio Veritatis*, 1902, p. 222.

[2] Some think his acquaintance was 'biblical and literary' (Abbott) rather than personal.

pressions the chief factor must necessarily be the presentation of the person and teaching of Jesus. That this differs widely from that of the Synoptics is admitted on all hands; and the main questions which confront the student to-day are such as these —To what are these differences due? and do they exceed the limits which (it may be imagined) would naturally restrain a companion of the Master?

The general answer which is given with increasing confidence by numerous voices, tells us that the Fourth Gospel offers us not so much a *record* as an *interpretation* of the life and work of Christ. Such an interpretation is necessarily framed in the light of subsequent experience. It arises in the midst of new ideas, it is a product of reflection on the past under the influence of a fresh environment. 'The key to the Fourth Gospel,' says the Bampton Lecturer of 1890, Archdeacon Watkins,[1] 'lies in *translation*, or, if this term has acquired too narrow a meaning, transmutation, re-formation, growth; nor need we shrink from the true sense of the terms, development and evolution.' There is more here than translation from the vernacular Aramaic into Greek, for the materials of the Synoptic narratives have passed through that process, and retain the vivid imprint of their origin. There is a translation of ideas as well as words, as we pass from the hills of Galilee or the streets of Jerusalem to some meeting-place of Jewish and Hellenic culture, where, as in Alexandria or Ephesus, the national hopes of Israel were accommo-

[1] *Modern Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*, p. 426.

dated to new views of the world and life. Accordingly, one writer cautiously tells us that the Gospel is 'meant to supplement the Synoptic type in view of subsequent developments of thought.'[1] Another records 'the general impression made upon many modern readers that the Gospel is the work of one who, looking back upon the life of Christ over many years of Church development, is re-casting that life in the light of the experience gained during a long period of Christian life and thought.'[2]

We are warned, therefore, that 'the Gospel, though historical in form, is not an historical work in the strict sense. It is an attempt to present in the form of a record of the word and works of Jesus the author's idea of his character and personality.'[3] No

[1] Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 435.

[2] The Rev. W. C. Allen, in *Contentio Veritatis*, p. 224. 'It is easy to say,' continues the same writer, 'that if we suppose St. John to have lived to an advanced age, all these points find their solution. But is that really the case? Is there not between John the son of Zebedee, the eye-witness of the life of Christ on the one hand, and the Christian philosopher and theologian who wrote this Gospel on the other, a gulf in respect of time and thought and relation to historic fact which it is difficult to bridge?'

[3] McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* (1897), p. 609. In a subsequent passage Dr. McGiffert adds, p. 611, 'John composes with a free hand. . . But it is to be noticed that the impression of Christ's personality which is gained from the Fourth Gospel is due not simply to the matter but also to the form of the discourses which it contains. The ideas in many of those discourses if uttered in the brief incisive gnomic style, or in the parabolic form which is so common in the Synoptic Gospels, and only at the impulse of a particular occasion or suggestion, would leave a very different impression. As it is, they are repeated and elaborated and emphasized to such an extent, that they leave the impression that Jesus was thinking and talking constantly of his own divine personality, and of his own unique significance, not alone for those who were following him but also for all the world. But if reliance is to be placed upon the united testimony of the Synoptic Gospels, such an impression as this can hardly be accurate.'

less emphatic is the judgment of another distinguished American scholar, 'With all due allowance, it is impossible to regard the set discourses of John, as a whole, as other than literary compositions by the author of the Johannine Epistles.'[1]

The grounds of the impression in which representatives of different theological schools thus concur, will be briefly set forth hereafter. A few words may first be said on a hypothesis yearly gaining more acceptance, which views the Gospel as founded on traditional apostolic material, re-cast and worked into new forms by a disciple's hand. That such a hand is present in the last chapter has been widely admitted. The Gospel reaches its natural close in $20^{30\text{-}31}$. The subsequent appendix, so recognised even by Zahn, 'prince of conservative scholars'[2]—appears due to another hand. The scene is unexpectedly transferred from Jerusalem to Galilee; the story of the miraculous draught of fishes seems a new handling of the incident in *Luke* $5^{1\text{-}9}$, not without reference in Peter's leap into the water to the scene on the heaving waves in *Matt.* $14^{28\text{-}31}$. But why should the

[1] Bacon, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1900, p. 259. Is the writer then, enquires Dr. Bacon, 'presenting to us what he conceives the teaching of Jesus actually to have been, or is he purposely idealising? Probably neither. He is not consciously either historical or unhistorical. He simply frees his own mind on these essentials of Christian doctrine without considering the question of historicity. But we may well ask, Could the mind of an eye-witness and peculiarly devoted follower of Jesus be so emptied of the veritable utterances of the Master as to leave room for such idealisation? When we consider how others were perpetuating the historical discourses, an affirmative answer is not easy.'

[2] Cp. Bacon, *Introduction*, p. 269. Weiss, *Die Vier Evangelien*, 1902, p. 599.

triple question to Peter, matching his triple denial, be placed here [15-19]? Might it not have been expected at the first meeting between the repentant apostle and his risen Lord?[1] It leads directly to a prediction of Peter's death, and this in turn to a passage in [23] which 'clearly presupposes' the death of the 'disciple whom Jesus loved.' The attestation in the following verse [24] is plainly editorial; but it is not due to the reporter of the apostolic testimony, it stands at a yet further remove from the fountain head.[2] Yet the 'we know' has its analogies elsewhere; 'we beheld his glory,' 1[14]; 'of his fulness we all received,' 1[16]; and at the opening of the first Letter (and through much that follows) 'that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also.'

But if the editor may thus write in the name of his fellow-believers, may it not be possible that he may have drawn his materials from more than one source, or embodied contributions belonging to a whole school of thought[3]? 'The elders' of Irenæus, standing in a common relation to 'John and the other apostles,' rise dimly before our view. Delicate literary signs both in the structure and the style of different parts of the Gospel tend in this direction.[4] Thus already in the prologue there seem marks of

[1] So Wendt, *Gospel according to St. John*, p. 250, quoting Loofs.

[2] Cp. Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, vol. ii., pp. 208-10.

[3] This suggestion was made in a paper read to the Society of Historical Theology at Oxford by the Rev. Charles Hargrove, in November, 1892.

[4] See this thesis worked out by Wendt, *Gospel according to St. John*, from the point of view of an apostolic source, and a later editor.

intrusive matter in $^{6-8}$ and ^{15}.[1] The real answer to the question of the Pharisees' deputation to John the Baptist, 1^{25}, is contained in ^{26} and ^{31}. In the colloquy with Nicodemus the discourse suddenly passes at ^{11} into the plural address; and a theological exposition begins at ^{16} in which the hand of the commentator seems clearly visible. The reference in 7^{23} to the cure of the impotent man on the sabbath in 5 suggests that 7^{15-24} may really have followed 5^{47}. In 12^{44-50} a sort of summary of previous discourses closes the public teaching, yet without place or occasion. The sequel of 14^{31}, 'Arise, let us go hence,' seems found in 18^{1}. It is a singular fact[2] that in this group of chapters 14-17 the particle *oun* 'then,' 'therefore,' 'so,' $1^{21\ 22}$, etc., which is to *John* what 'immediately' is to *Mark* (it occurs more than 200 times in this Gospel), is almost wholly wanting. It may be traced through $13^{6\ 12\ 14\ 24\ 26\ 27\ 30\ 31}$; it reappears in $18^{3\ 4\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 10\ 11}$, etc. But in 14-17 it is found only in $16^{17\ 18\ 22}$. This is partly due to the greater continuity of the discourse. But on the one hand there are many conversational breaks where it would be natural, e.g. $14^{5\ 6\ 8\ 9}$, $16^{29\ 31}$; and on the other hand it is elsewhere at least occasionally present in speech, as in 1^{25}, 3^{29}, 4^{11}, 6^{62}, $8^{24\ 36\ 38}$(margin), $9^{11\ 19}$, 12^{50}, 13^{14}. In the allied letters it occurs only in 3 *John* ^{8}. Further there are signs of different

[1] These verses seem to interrupt the context, and may have been derived from some other introductory narrative. The reference in ^{15} to previous words of John implies a story in which they occurred. But no such words are found in any earlier extant record.

[2] Pointed out by Mr. Hargrove.

conceptions of doctrine, of which some may be noted hereafter on the eschatological side.[1] It is not perhaps without meaning in this respect that while the exalted term 'the Word' is never again applied to Jesus after the Prologue to the Gospel, it is used elsewhere both in the Gospel and the Letter with much greater freedom. Thus the presence of the Word in the believer is the source of his spiritual strength:—

1 *John* 2^{14}, I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the *logos* of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the evil one.

The verb 'abide' or 'dwell' is specially characteristic of Johannine usage to express spiritual relations, e.g. *John* $6^{27\,56}$, $8^{31\,35}$, $12^{24\,34\,46}$, $14^{10\,17}$, $15^{4\text{-}7\,9\text{-}10,\,16}$, 1 *John* $2^{6\,10\,24\,27\,28}$, etc. The same term *logos* is also employed with the simple verb to 'be':—

1 *John* 1^{10}, If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his *logos* is not in us.

In the absence of the *logos* lies the cause of Jewish obstinacy and want of faith:—

John 5^{38}, Ye have not his *logos* abiding in you; for whom he sent, him ye believe not.

As the term 'abide' shows, in these passages the *logos* means more than an instruction or command, more even than the sum of Christ's teaching or revelation; it is a divine principle of life, practically equivalent to those high modes of fellowship with the Eternal, wherein Father and Son may be said to come to the disciple and make their 'abode' with

[1] See below, pp. 443-6.

him, *John* 14^{28}.[1] But this points to a wider use than that of the Prologue, where it is exalted to transcendent glory. May not this be a sign that somewhat different aspects of thought are represented in the Gospel?[2] On this question, however, a clearer judgment will be possible, when we have further considered some of the chief features of its view of Jesus.

IV.

The interpreters of the Gospel have often started from the Prologue, and have described the earthly career of Jesus as the manifestation of the eternal Logos in the form of our humanity.[3] That character,

[1] The phrase in 15^{7}, 'If ye abide in me, and my sayings abide in you,' is again on another level.

[2] Other uses of the term deserve attention. It frequently designates the preaching of Jesus, e.g. 'his word' *John* 4^{41}; but it is also used by Jesus himself, 'my *logos*' 5^{24}, 8^{31} 'abide in my word,' 8^{37} 'my word hath no place in you,' cp. $^{43\ 51\ 52}$, $14^{23\ 24}$, $15^{3\ 20}$. Further, 17^{6}, 'they have kept thy word'; ^{14} 'I have given them thy word'; ^{17} 'thy word is truth'; and even 8^{55} 'I know him, and keep his word.' Can the writer of these passages have himself conceived Jesus as the Logos who was 'with God'? In 12^{48} the function of judgment is ascribed to 'the *logos* which I have uttered': so flexible was the word, and so easily could it advance towards personification. We might say 'he shall be judged by (i.e., according to) the word' etc.; but hardly 'the word shall judge.'

[3] So, primarily, Baur. This is declared to be the necessary point of view for scientific exposition: cp. M. Jean Réville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, 1901, p. 119, 'to try to explain the Gospel without taking account of the prologue, is almost as reasonable as trying to construe a text in a foreign language without taking account of the grammar of that language.' I have indicated above why this rigour seems to me not only needless but dangerous: it imposes one interpretation on a book which contains hints of more than one. In an essay in the *Zeitschr. für Theologie und Kirche*, 1892, on the relation of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel to the whole book, Harnack lays it down (p. 230) that the Prologue is not the key to the Gospel; it is only prefixed by the Evangelist to prepare Hellenistic readers for it.

however, is not ascribed to him after the opening verses; it does not reappear in the Gospel itself; and it seems better, therefore, for our present enquiry, to adopt the writer's own statement of his purpose at the original close of the work, 20^{31}:—

> These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye may have life in his name.

Two aims are here formulated, the production of belief in the disciple, and through belief the attainment of life. The emphasis laid on 'believing' throughout the Gospel must have struck every reader. It is the more remarkable because the noun corresponding to the verb, rendered in our version 'faith,' and familiar to us alike in the Synoptic Gospels and in Paul, only occurs once in the Johannine writings, 1 *John* 5^{4}. It is evident at the outset that the belief which the writer seeks to engender is not a simple intellectual act like the acceptance of a geometrical theorem, such as that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, or the recognition of a historical truth, such as that Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate. The appeals which pervade the Gospel are addressed to the spiritual affections, 'Ye believe in God, believe also in me,' 14^{1}; 'believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me'; 'or else,' it is added with a direct reference to the 'works' in which the power of Christianity was manifested, 'believe me for the very works' sake,' 14^{11}.[1] Of such trust the

[1] On the nature of the 'works,' see below, p. 432 f.

result is that 'he that believeth in me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die'; and Martha answers, 'I have believed that thou art the Christ, the Son of God,' 11^{25-27}. Belief, then, generates life, and this life is in its nature divine; nay, it is the life of a son of God himself; for the First Letter tells us, 1 *John* 5^{1}, 'whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten (or born) of God.' To believe that Jesus was the Messiah was, in the first place, the way of entrance into the Church. It was by this faith that the Christian was marked off not only from the Jew, but in the same manner from the Gentile. It was in fact a summary phrase for being a Christian. Hence it denoted all the new emotions, the new desires, the new hopes, the new aims, the new endeavours, the new outlook on the world, the new affections towards God and man, which filled the believer's soul, and constituted that fresh element of being known in the vocabulary of the early Church as 'life.' Viewed in this light, the Gospel has its purpose in the production of Christian experience. And the foundation of the sonship of the disciple is the sonship of Christ.

Such a book naturally seeks to achieve its result along various lines. The Gospel, consequently, has different aspects. It is full of apparently historical detail. It presents an ethical ideal, 'even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another,' 13^{34}. It exhibits a mode of eternal life, not as something to be 'inherited' or gained by any course of conduct,

but as something to be realised by knowledge,[1] 17^3. And it even opens with a profound speculative construction of the person who is the medium of that knowledge. But through it all there runs a note of impassioned conviction. The writer has lived in the centre of the ideas and feelings which he strives to beget in others :—

1 *John* $1^{1\text{-}4}$: That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal *life*, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us; yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ: and these things we write, that our (*or*, your) joy may be fulfilled.[2]—Cp. 1 *John* 4^{14}.

'We beheld his glory,' says the Gospel, 1^{14}. It accordingly assumes historic form. But it is in reality, if we may so phrase it, superhistoric. Its value does not lie in the details of journeys, or the annual round of feasts. The notes of place and time are really indifferent. Nor are even the words or works of Jesus the essential matters with which

[1] It is again noteworthy that while *gnosis* occurs repeatedly in the Pauline writings, the Johannine avoid the noun, while using the verb 'to know' repeatedly. The Gospel is, in fact, a delineation of the true *Gnosis*, as opposed to the false.

[2] Here is the key to passages such as *John* 15^{11}, 'These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy may be in you, and *that* your joy may be fulfilled'; or 17^{13}, 'these things I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves.' Cp. somewhat differently on the basis of a Synoptic saying (transferred, however, from its original meaning into the sphere of Christ's 'name'), 16^{24}, 'hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be fulfilled.'

the author is concerned. They are only the vehicles of something behind. There is a realm of the unseen, a whole world of thought and feeling on another plane; and through symbols and emblems the writer strives to present it in pictures to the believer's gaze. This is the meaning of the abstractions with which Jesus is again and again identified, 'light,' 'truth,' or 'life.' We even read 'I am the resurrection.'

But what kind of equation can be established between a person and a process? How are we to identify an individual and an event? To many modern readers such words are stumbling-blocks. It is difficult for us with our antecedents, and our present modes of education, to realise the atmosphere which made them natural. We are brought up in Christianity. We are familiar with its teachings; since first we can remember, the words of Jesus have been constantly upon our lips. Christianity, therefore, rarely enters our lives as a fresh power. As we begin to think about it, we find that our realisation of the personality of Jesus is beset by many limitations. We see him environed by the ideas and forces of his age, cherishing hopes which events did not fulfil, interpreting the agencies of the world in a way no longer true either to our religion or our philosophy. Moreover, as we trace the history of the Church, we note how many corrupting elements have mingled in it from various sources quite remote from him. We cannot help observing that while Christianity has wrought in-

calculable good in human hearts, it has failed to achieve that victory over evil for which its first leaders hoped. While our present moral and religious life owes it a debt quite beyond our reckoning, it is not the sole source of our best attainments in thought and character. And in other lands we discern it now as one among several religions, some of them founded on traditions still more ancient, exercising wide sway over the thoughts of men, recorded in venerable literatures, and embodying principles not easily to be dislodged from the social organisations which have grown up under their influence.

To the first disciples, however, no such considerations were present. They were full of ardour in their own age, and of confidence in the future. Their whole being was quickened with the vivid affections which had been awakened in their souls. To them a new energy had visibly appeared. They had felt it enter their own lives and re-shape their very natures: they saw it around them, advancing from city to city and land to land, saving men from darkness and error, bringing them into the glory of truth, lifting them out of sin and sorrow, and filling them with a rapture of love, trust, and joy. To us Christianity is often something abstract and impersonal. In one aspect, it is a great historical generalisation. But the early believers spoke of Christ, and they thought of a person, not a movement. To them Christianity was a life, not an organisation, or a tendency, or the impalpable spirit of an

age. They looked upon the changes which Christ had wrought, and they saw in them a mighty manifestation of the moral and spiritual forces which held the world together, which gave consistency to the outward universe, and shaped the destinies of history. In Christ who had been sent by God, God showed himself to man—'he that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' The power which wrought his wondrous works was not his own.—'I can do nothing of myself'—it was the Father's. The life which flowed from him into the heart of the disciple, had first flowed into him from God, and all power for word or work was derived from on high. So to have Jesus in the heart, to have his light, his love, was to have God; it was to be born from above, to be begotten of God.

This parallelism of the Christian's experience with Christ's had already been the theme of the impassioned teaching of the apostle Paul. But the mode of expression was different. To him the crisis of Messiah's career had been his death and resurrection. These events, accordingly, supplied the figure for the believer who was 'dead to sin' but 'alive unto God in Christ Jesus.' 'crucified with Christ,' 'crucified unto the world,' 'buried with him through baptism into death,' 'raised with Christ,' and even 'made to sit with him in the heavenly places.'[1] The Johannine language is moulded on another type; the ideal correspondence is expressed

[1] *Rom.* 6^{11}; *Gal.* 2^{20}, ^{14}; *Rom.* 6^{4}; *Col.* 3^{1}; *Ephes.* 2^{6}. Whatever be the literary origin of the last two passages, they certainly embody Pauline ideas.

in a new idiom, but the same experience lies behind it. The phraseology starts from the conception of the Messianic 'Son';—'whosoever believeth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is begotten (or born) of God'—but it becomes the description of the ideal Christian. In the Synoptic teaching, to be the sons of God is the final goal of the disciples' endeavour: 'blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God'; 'love your enemies, that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven.' The Johannine writings present birth 'from above'—to be begotten or born of God[1]—as the actual condition of the believer. This likewise is in accordance with the language of Paul, 'for as many as are led by the spirit of God, these are sons of God' (*Rom.* 8^{14}). For John, the chief mark of such birth is love: 'love is of God, and whosoever loveth is begotten (or born) of God, and knoweth God,' 1 *John* 4^{7}, and such birth carries with it tremendous consequences:—

1 *John* 3^{9}, Whosoever is begotten (or born) of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him; and he cannot sin because he is begotten of God.

5^{18}, We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not.

Such permanent power was there in this august generation, that the writer who had seen it at work among the men and women, the shopkeepers and craftsmen, the masters and slaves, who made up the

[1] The word is used of physical birth, *John* $3^{4\,6}$, 18^{37}; of spiritual in the same colloquy with Nicodemus $3^{3\text{-}7}$, and often elsewhere. Of Jesus it is not used in the spiritual sense unless 1 John 5^{18} be applied to him (with Westcott and others).

Churches of Asia, could explicitly claim sinlessness for those who were thus divinely born. Doubtless there was a sense in which Jesus was designated the 'only begotten Son'[1]; but 'as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God,' so that the Letter declares, 'Beloved, now are we the children of God.'[2] The world might be hostile or ignorant; but the children of God rest in God's love, and into the sublime fellowship of life between Jesus and the Father they also enter, 'that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, *art* in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us.'[3]

The progress of Christianity already gave a wider scope to this aim than had been realised at the outset of its preaching. The Gospel had been carried along the Mediterranean. It had appealed to men of every race; its effects were limited to no single nationality. Already Paul beheld it transcending differences of class, sex, and country: the Greek and the Jew, the barbarian and the Scythian, the free and the enslaved, all obeyed its call and felt its power. The Christian recognised in his own case, and he observed in others, a vital change. Life, habits, thoughts, affections, all were altered. The immediate source of all this was Christ, and the purpose of Christianity seemed unlimited and without distinction. It must embrace all human kind; in

[1] *John* 1^{18}, $3^{16\ 18}$; 1 *John* 4^{9} 'only-begotten' apparently in the sense of 'only,' *Luke* 7^{12}, 8^{42}, 9^{38}.

[2] *John* 1^{12}; 1 *John* 3^{2}.

[3] *John* 17^{21}.

the language of the Baptist, *John* 1^{29}, 'Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' The Gospel, then, has a universal significance; and the place of the Gentiles is assured. To the Samaritan woman is delivered the charter of universal religion:

John $4^{21\ 23\text{-}24}$, The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father.

The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth.

Why is not this uttered in the Temple, in the hearing of priest and Levite? It is because it represents not so much a protest against the unspiritual worship under the Law, as the release of religion from all local and traditional forms, and the new conception of it as a spiritual relation into which all might enter. The Samaritan woman with her five husbands—the symbol (it is supposed) of the settlers of five nationalities each with their own god[1]—is the typical figure of heathenism, which

[1] 2 *Kings* 17^{24}, Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim. The sixth husband who is no husband, denotes the schismatic worship on Mt. Gerizim. So Pfleiderer, *Urchristenth.* 2nd ed. 1902, vol. ii., p. 356, following Hengstenberg; Jean Réville, *Le Quatriéme Évangile*, 1901, p. 150. Further highly interesting developments of allegory in the whole scene are traced by Abbott, *Encycl. Bibl.* 'Gospels,' ii. 1801. If Dr. Abbott's illustrative use of Philo be admitted, it would seem that there was a regular vocabulary of symbolism well established, and presumably intelligible to those who were trained in these peculiar modes of thought. The key may be sometimes applied in the wrong way; but of the presence of this element there can be no doubt. This is the real answer to the plea of Dr. Dods, *Expositor's Greek Test.*, vol. i., p. 679, 'The writer professes to produce certain facts which have powerfully influenced the minds of men, and have produced faith. If

knew not what it worshipped, [22], for that saving knowledge lay with Israel in the past, though now it is thrown open to all. Jesus, therefore, is in this aspect the 'light of the world,' 8^{12}, in another sense from that in which the same designation is given to the disciples in *Matt.* 5^{14}. And Christianity, though in one aspect it issues out of Judaism, is, in another, on a really different plane. Here is no consciousness of historical development, such as pervaded the thought of Paul. The law has been no *pædagogus* to bring Israel to Christ, *Gal.* 3^{24}. The struggle concerning the admission of the Gentiles is over. The good shepherd has 'other sheep which are not of this fold'; they, too, must be brought in, 'and there shall be one flock, one shepherd,' 10^{16}. So Caiaphas involuntarily prophesies that 'Jesus should die for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad,' 11^{52}; and Jesus prays on the last night not only for the apostles, 'but for them also that believe on me through their word,' 17^{20}. But if Jesus had thus sanctioned the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles by word and deed in his own lifetime, the opposition to Paul's great mission would have been impossible.

The scope of Christianity is thus conceived upon a different scale. True, the disciples were addressed as the 'light of the world'; true, the field of the

these pretended facts were fictions, then the writer is dishonest and beneath contempt.' The Gospel is judged unjustly if allowance is not made for the imaginative atmosphere in which it is conceived.

sower was defined by the same term, *Matt.* 5^{14}, 13^{38}.[1] But the Synoptic teaching gives this word no prominence like that which it acquires in the Fourth Gospel. There Jesus is depicted as 'the lamb which taketh away the sin of the world'; he is 'the light of the world, the saviour of the world'; but though the world was made through him, 1^{10}, it nevertheless lies in fundamental opposition to God.[2] On the one hand is the upper realm of light and truth, of love and life; on the other, are the counterparts below of darkness and falsehood, hatred and death. These have their home in 'the world'; which is, indeed, sometimes identified with the visible scene around us (e.g 1 *John* $2^{15\text{-}17}$), but much more often denotes the sum of human life, the sphere of man's activity and character. What, then, becomes of the conception presented in the First Three Gospels, of the warfare between Messiah and the powers of evil? It has undergone a complete transformation. Christ is, indeed, in essential conflict with Satan, 13^{27}, under the name of the 'devil' or the 'prince of this world,' 8^{44}, 13^{2}, 1 *John* $3^{8\,10}$; 12^{31}, 14^{30}, 16^{11}. But the contest is not waged with the demons. Not a single sufferer is delivered from the bondage of an evil spirit. The belief, indeed, is not unrecognised, for

[1] In this latter case there is good reason to believe that the parable is secondary, and the exposition consequently later still. Cp. *First Three Gospels*, ed. 2, p. 372-3; Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, vol. ii. (1899), p. 562.

[2] 1 *John* 5^{19}, 'We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one.' Here is another mark of difference of conception. The 'world' of the Prologue is not identical with the world ruled by the devil.

three times over the charge of being possessed is flung against Jesus himself, 7^{20}, 8^{48-52}, 10^{20}; but the great struggle between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan does not take the form of the expulsion of the 'devils.' It is transferred to the sphere of religious experience. The function of Christ is to conquer the world; and the disciple, in his turn, achieves the same end.

Over against the vast forces of ignorance, error, and unfaith, stands the little group of believers. Chosen out of a hostile society by the election of the truth, and hated by the unbelieving multitude, they continue in their own persons the ancient opposition between the world and God. This is the real scene where the powers of good and evil meet and clash. In technical language the Son of God is manifested that he may destroy the works of the devil, 1 *John* 3^{8}: and the subjection of the Adversary is accomplished by Messiah's death and the exaltation of the Son to his former glory. For this is the beginning of the advance of the true knowledge of God and Christ, by which the 'prince of this world' is stripped of his power and 'cast out,' 12^{31}—the term used of the demons in the Synoptic teaching, *Matt.* 12^{26-28}. From another point of view the same entry of Messiah into the heavenly life, the same growth and progress of the Church on earth which followed it, constitute the judgment by which the same evil power is condemned, 16^{11}. The language ascribed to Christ at once reflects and transfigures the actual events which followed. It was the dis-

ciples who were striving in the battlefield. 'I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the *logos* of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome (conquered) the evil one,' 1 *John* 2[14]; conquest was certain for those who were born from above; 'whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world,' 1 *John* 5[4]. The issue for faith is sure: Messiah's triumph is the pledge of the victory of the Church: 'in the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world,' *John* 16[33].

If the Son of God is manifested that he may 'destroy the works of the devil,' what works does he employ for this purpose? They are, naturally, the works of God, *John* 9[3]: 'We must work,' says Jesus (associating the disciples with him [4], as in 3[11] 'we speak'), 'the works of him that sent me.' To these, therefore, he appeals as unimpeachable witnesses to his true character, 5[36], 10[25]. They have been given him by the Father; their sum constitutes one continuous 'work' the discharge of which is like heavenly food, 4[34]; on the last night of his earthly life he can look back and say, 17[4]—

> I glorified thee on the earth having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do.

What, then, are these works which are the seal and testimony of his mission? The language of the Evangelist shows that he understands by them the wondrous signs which are wrought by Christ: 'what doest thou for a sign that we may see, and believe thee? what workest thou?' 6[30]: and he

closes his narrative with the assurance that many more were performed than were recorded, 20^{30-31}:

Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

It is the purpose of the signs, then, to produce belief. Such also, is the significance of the works:—

10^{37-38}, If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father.

14^{11}, Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake.

Why should Jesus here rest his appeal on a ground which elsewhere he repudiates? 'Have faith in God,' he urges, *Mark* 11^{22}: 'Why doth this generation seek a sign? verily I say unto you, there shall no sign be given unto this generation,' *Mark* 8^{12}. The answer is to be found in the real character of the 'works.' It has already been noticed that in the Fourth Gospel Christ's whole career may be viewed as one long 'work.' But it is also noteworthy that the 'works' are closely associated with 'words.'

14^{10}, The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself, but the Father abiding in me doeth his works.

15^{20}, If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin. . . .^{24}, If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin.[1]

[1] On this distinction between signs and works, of which Wendt makes special use in support of his theory of an Evangelic source and a later editorial treatment, see his *Gospel according to St. John*, p. 58 ff.

Part of the 'work' of Jesus, then, certainly is his teaching. This is one aspect of his Messianic character as the 'truth' and the 'life.' His whole ministry is an imparting of life, 'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly,' 10^{10}. This gift of life is among the greater 'works' which the Father will show to the Son, $5^{20\text{-}21}$; and this is the real attestation of the working of Christ in the world. Looking out over the corn-fields of Samaria, Jesus declared them white already unto harvest. The labourers would gather fruit unto life eternal; their toil was the preaching of the Gospel and the harvesting of souls. And such 'works' were identical with his own. The doers of ill, representatives of the world, hated the light and would not come to it, lest their works should be reproved. But the doers of the truth had no such fear: they came to the light, that their works might be 'manifested' that they had been wrought in God, $3^{20\,21}$. Once more is the parallel drawn between the Teacher and the disciple, between Christ and the Church.

The evidential character of the 'signs,' then, does not lie in the external event. It is not the cure of the cripple, the multiplication of the loaves, the gift of sight to the blind, not even the summons of Lazarus—four days dead—from the grave, that is the essential element. These narratives must be studied in the light of the hidden meanings everywhere implied, and sometimes frankly disclosed. The Evangelist lives in a world in which the transition is easy from the symbol to the

spiritual reality. His concern is not with the physical but with the ideal. He clothes his thought in the forms of a scene of sight and touch. But he really shows us the operation of spiritual energies. The multitude who were fed in the desert, are warned not to work for perishable food, 6^{27}, and immediately want to know what they must do to 'work the works of God.' The 'work of God,' answers Jesus, is to 'believe on him whom he hath sent.' Faith in Christ was the great instrument of the progress of the Church; and in the stories of the 'bread of life,' the 'light of the world' which carried judgment along with it—'that they which see not may see, and that they which see may become blind'—, and the 'resurrection and the life,' the parables of Christian trust and Christian experience were writ large for all to read. Here lay the secret of the promise, 14^{12}:—

> Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater *works* than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father.

What greater works? Feed more thousands, set more lame men on their feet, raise more dead? Assuredly not. The works are works of the spirit. The superiority of the disciples' achievement depends on the departure of the Teacher, because the Church could only set forth to win the world when he was on earth no more. The spread of the truth meant the recovery of true vision, the invigoration of the morally halt, the quickening of the dead in trespasses and sins, on a colossal scale. When Pliny described to

the emperor Trajan (111-112, A.D.) the abandoned altars, the deserted temples, the neglected worship, of Bithynia, where Christianity had already made unexampled progress, he bore testimony to the reaping from the seed of apostolic toil; the fruits were being already garnered to eternal life; others had laboured, and the Church had entered into their labour.

V.

Such was the high significance of the belief that Jesus is the Christ; the experience of the 'children of God' is everywhere parallel with that of the 'Son;' and mightier things are wrought by the believer than Messiah himself had accomplished. For those who believe, 'have life in his name.'

The conception of 'life' as it emerges in the Fourth Gospel is the result of a long spiritual development. Centuries before Jesus, the prophets had offered Israel the two alternatives of 'life' and 'death': 'choose life,' cried the Deuteronomic preacher, 'that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed': but the life was the life of the nation on its ancient land. The same symbols served the sages to denote the issues of wisdom and folly.[1] Two gates there were, one narrow and one wide; they opened on two paths, one leading to destruction, and the other to 'life,' *Matt.* 7^{13-14}. 'Life' in the coming age would be the privilege of those who should enter Messiah's realm; and it was natural to ask the

[1] *Prov.* 8^{35-36}, $9^{6\ 18}$, etc.

Teacher what must be done to inherit it, *Mark* 10^{17}. There is no 'age to come' in *John*. The 'door' is there, let the believer pass at once into the fold; Jesus is himself the 'door,' the 'way,' and the 'life.' Such sayings reveal at once that the Messianic salvation is not something to be postponed to the future; it is to be realised at once. Moreover, it is not to be gained by 'doing' anything: its essence lies in knowledge, 17^{4}:—

> This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, *even* Jesus Christ.

To 'be in him that is true,' 1 *John* 5^{20}, is already to have eternal life. The purpose of Messiah's coming is that men may have life; and when they turn away hostile or indifferent, he pleads 'Ye will not come to me that ye may have life.' This was already the experience of the preachers of the Gospel. 'Life' was the only word which could describe for Paul the essential quality of the 'mind of the spirit' when it had been raised from the death of sin into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The quickening of this life is a frequent theme of the Evangelist, who shows us Messiah in colloquy with manifold types of character,—the Jews again and again scornfully indifferent, or openly antagonistic,—the timid enquirer Nicodemus—the fickle Samaritan woman—the excellent but conventional Martha—the deep-souled Mary, with the general result that the issue of his appeal is carried to a higher stage, 'No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me, draw him.'

Most intimate, and at the same time most comprehensive of all, is the farewell address in the upper chamber after the last supper. The audience, however, is not limited to the Eleven from whom the traitor has now severed himself. There is a wider apostolate sent forth into the world; and Messiah's words are designed for the whole Church. The chief theme is the fellowship of the disciples; what power was it that had separated them from the world? what power was it that united them among themselves? The answer is not reached by reasoning or analysis: it is a record of experience. In form the language of Jesus may speak in the accents of prophecy; but in reality it reposes upon actual fact. There are different spheres and modes of knowledge; and not all kinds of knowledge are gained in the same way. The preacher of a new Gospel does not address himself to the enquiring intellect, nor act by arguments of logic on the mind. Spiritual things must be spiritually discerned. The attainment of religious truth will not seem to the soul like an achievement of its own energy: rather will it be a gift to it from some higher source. Such knowledge is not the result of an examination of evidence, or the issue of processes of research; it is something realised by insight where there was before a blank; and the power of vision has been imparted, for it was not self-produced. The unseeing eye might stare for ever into vacancy and behold nothing: but when once the touch of heaven lets in the light, all things are radiant and the world is full

of God. The halt and maimed may wait for years bemoaning their impotence, but incapable of overcoming the stubbornness of habit or temper: only let a new affection break in upon them from some loftier soul, and they, too, can rise and follow the summons of a diviner love. Nay, the very dead in trespasses and sins, loosed from the cerements of convention or self-will, may step forth to the day when the voice of power awakens them to life. Yet these marvels are not self-wrought. Neither was discipleship really a voluntary act. The messengers of the Good News, as they presented their summons to faith, saw it work here its blessed work, and fall there fruitless and cold; a divine election distinguished those who could respond; 'Ye did not choose me,' says Jesus, 'but I chose you, that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide,' 15^{16}. Behind Christ, then, stands the Father. Messiah himself can only draw those who are appointed for his attraction: 'All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me,' 6^{37}; 'I manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world,' 17^{6}. The self-conscious life is swallowed up in grace. Are any indifferent to its invitation? the failure does not lie with the messenger or with the truth; it is referred to the ultimate purpose of God, and finds its cause (though not its explanation) in the timeless depths whence came alike the world and man.[1]

[1] A somewhat different view is involved in the language which describes the Jews as 'of their father the devil,' 8^{44}; cp. generally the 'children of God' and the 'children of the devil,' 1 *John* 3^{10}.

Religion will always regard its own achievements as the product of a will higher than its own. As the saving energy of the Church carried it forwards, and drew into it more and more 'out of the world,' the source and seat of its power evidently lay in God. Through what medium, however, was this power transmitted? What spiritual nexus held the believers together in fellowship? The Church, which supplied the Apostle Paul with so vivid a type of organic unity through the contributions of its several members to the welfare of the whole, is naturally nowhere named. But the conception is constantly present in the form of a double relation, that of the disciples to their heavenly Lord, and that of the disciples among one another. This is the meaning of the emblem of the vine and its branches, 15^{1-8}. It was an ancient symbol, familiar alike to the Jew and to the Greek. It had been the type of Israel's nation in the past, *Ps.* 80^{8-19}; it was associated in Hellenic thought with some of the most sacred mysteries of death and life. The Christian now found in it the figure of his union with his Master,[1] and the place of both together in the husbandry of the Father. Neither vine nor branches can exist apart; each is necessary to the other; in Johannine language, each is 'in' the other. Only the branches that abide in the vine bear fruit: the withered boughs are removed and burned. Is it necessary

[1] The figurative use of the vine in connexion with the Eucharistic cup is obvious in the thanksgiving prayer, *Teaching of the XII. Apostles*, ix. 2, but the application of the symbol is not clear.

to turn poetry into prose? The Gospel itself tells us what are the practical equivalents translated from the language of personality into actual experience: 'If ye abide in me, and my words [sayings] abide in you,' 15^{7}—this is the actual effect of Christian teaching: and conversely, 'If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love' ^{10}, and 'he that keepeth his commandments abideth in him, and he in him,' 1 *John* 3^{24}. Righteousness and love are the sure tokens of Messiah's presence.

But there was another aspect of the Church's life. Jesus had departed, and his messengers went forth into the world. They found themselves confronted with new ideas; fresh modes of thought beset them, for which it was needful to find a home within the Gospel. How could these be accommodated in Christian teaching? What form could represent the process? The Teacher had himself foreseen it: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now,' 16^{12}. To impart this guidance in the future would be the work of the Spirit of truth, another Paraclete,[1] a helper who would be always with them, and be the organ of progressive revelation. Nor would his function be limited to teaching. As new questions were started and new answers found, as increasing numbers were gathered into the 'one flock,' the presence of the Church in the world involved a kind of continuous trial of the world, and the Spirit, therefore, might be

[1] 14^{16}, cp. 1 *John* 2^{1}.

said to convict it of sin and righteousness and judgment, when the works of good and evil were severed, and the lovers of the darkness were contrasted with the lovers of the light.[1] The revelation which Christ began, and which carried a discriminating power with it, was thus not complete in him. It was fulfilled in the expanding Church, which had a chrism for believers analogous to that which had rested on their Master; 'Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things' (or, ye all know [the truth]), 1 *John* 2^{20}, cp. ^{27}. Yet even this did not exhaust the source of life, or the modes of its transmission. Christ and the Spirit were but different messengers of the Father. The Son was himself the chief of heaven's apostles, sent[2] into the world for its deliverance, *John* 3^{17}, as John had been sent from God before him, 1^{6}, and as he sent his followers after him, 17^{18}:—

> As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world.

So the teaching 'Helper' is also sent by the Father, 14^{26}, but in the name of Christ,[3] whose work of imparting the knowledge of the truth he thus continues. Here, then, are three phases of the same ultimate reality. They differ in their historic form: as organs of teaching, Christ and the Spirit can be

[1] 16^{8}, cp. 3^{19}: on this transformation of the Synoptic idea of the judgment, see more below.

[2] Greek *apostello*, whence the word *apostolos*.

[3] So fluid are these conceptions that in 15^{26} the 'Helper' is to be sent by Christ, but its source is in the Father from whom he issues forth. The verb 'send' is in these passages *pempto*.

in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we *are* one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one.

The visible 'coming' of Jesus is thus transmuted in the Fourth Gospel into spiritual fact. The connexion of the second Advent with great external events is altogether severed.[1] Where are the 'signs' which fill the air with portents of impending change, the darkened sun, the moon eclipsed, the stars that fall from heaven? The grand scenic display which will usher in the new age, the Son of Man with angel-retinue and trumpet-blast descending from the sky, the rising multitude caught up from earth to meet him in the air—these have all vanished. Æonian life is not something to be inaugurated hereafter with a great 'renovation,' it is to be realised in the believers' life-time.[2] One entire order of ideas has almost disappeared, and another has taken its place. Echoes, indeed, of the older Messianic expectation may be heard here and there; but their very incongruity with their context betrays the 'translation' which the fundamental conceptions have undergone. The 'coming' (*parousia*) which in the Synoptic narratives is the theme of such solemn prophecy on the Mount of Olives,[3] is nowhere named in the Fourth Gospel, though it appears in the First Letter; it is the last hour, 2^{18}, let the disciples be prepared, 2^{28}:—

[1] See *ante*, Lect. VI., p. 373.

[2] Cp. *John* 14^{19}, 'because I live, ye shall live also.'

[3] See Lect VI., *ante*, p. 374.

And now, little children, abide in him; that if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.

But the outward and inward advent really appear side by side: 'the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth,' 2^8. In the Gospel the *parousia* is ignored. The visible return, with its transition amid the sympathy of nature from the close of an exhausted and decrepit age to the opening promise of the 'age to come,' is no longer true to faith. The great dramatic catastrophes in which Hebrew faith saw the assertion of the sovereignty of heaven, did not appeal to Hellenic thought.

The coming of the Son of Man was to be followed by the resurrection and the judgment.[1] What place is found for these in the Johannine eschatology? The terms are there, but the events which they denote have been converted into symbols of the inner life. 'I am the resurrrection and the life,' says Jesus to Martha, 11^{25}; 'he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die.' Messiah is himself the embodiment, the manifestation, of the true life: and as the Apostle Paul conceived the members of the Church as already 'risen,' so also in the Johannine school did the resurrection really take place when the believer entered the holy fellowship:—

1 *John* 3^{14}, We know that we have passed out of death into

[1] Martha naturally expects Lazarus to rise 'at the last day,' 11^{24}. On this phrase see below.

life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death.

To be brought into relation with Jesus through the Church, to accept his teaching, and put faith in the 'only true God,' is to realise already the Messianic salvation, *John* 5^{24}:—

He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.

There are, indeed, differences of response to the great invitation; but these have their source (as has been already noted) in the divine action itself, ^{21}:—

For as the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son also quickeneth whom he will.

The resurrection process, therefore, is already at work, ^{25}:—

The hour cometh, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.

That voice replaces the archangel's trumpet-blast: it is heard in the Church in the perpetuation of Messiah's teaching: it is heard in the soul of the disciple who accepts and fulfils Messiah's words. But, in truth, that is not all. With an unexpected transition from the inward spiritual process to an external event,[1] the speaker passes to the coming hour, $^{28\text{-}29}$:—

The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, to the resurrection of judgment.

[1] Thus reversing the usual order of Johannine presentation.

That this passage refers to the literally dead, reposing in their graves, seems generally agreed.[1] It is further noteworthy that the conditions of the award of life or of condemnation are perfectly general, for the doing of 'good' or 'ill' contains no reference to any specific word of Christ, but is as universal as the basis of acceptance or rejection in the great judgment-scene of *Matt.* 25. Wendt has here found traces of an editorial addition to an earlier discourse.[2] But the isolation of these two verses does not relieve all difficulties. The constant use of the third person, 'the Son,' the 'Son of God,' and 'Son of Man' in $^{19\text{-}29}$, implies a style quite different from that in ^{30} and the following section. Something must be conceded to declarations of such high solemnity; but the phrases 'the Son can do nothing of himself' ^{19}, and 'I can of myself do nothing' ^{30}, seem variants on a common type: and the earlier passage has analogies in the theological exposition of $3^{16\text{-}21}$. May not the ultimate solution be found in the hypothesis of diversities of the material out of which the Gospel was compiled? These may defy analysis, and yet their presence in the total product may be almost certain.[3]

[1] Cp. Martineau, *Seat of Authority*, p. 439; Holtzmann, *Hd. Comm.* in loc.; Wendt, *Gospel according to St. John*, p. 132; Weiss, *Die Vier Evangelien* (1902).

[2] *Gospel according to St. John*, p. 131.

[3] I find it hard to believe that $5^{19\text{-}29}$ with its numerous transitions was really written in one piece. Pfleiderer, however, *Urchristenthum*, 2nd ed. ii. p. 360, supposes that in $^{28\text{-}9}$ the evangelist combines with the spiritual view of $3^{17\text{-}21}$ the traditional expectation of a future judgment following the resurrection, in accordance with his permanent design of mediating between the faith of the Church and the Gnostic ideas. Remarkable in this connexion are the

The resurrection is the preliminary, in the Synoptic teaching, to the judgment. As the great assize of nations dissolves in the Fourth Gospel into an inward crisis in the believer's life, so is it with the last apportionment to heaven or hell. The judge's seat has fallen into the abyss; the uttered doom is heard no more. But just as the Spirit had a function of judgment in separating the faithful from the careless,[1] so does the Son divide the seeing from the blind. For truth is for ever entering the world in the person of prophet and teacher, and by its simple presence tests the vision of souls. It makes no display, but the result is inevitable; they whose eyes are opened, see; the rest, who cannot recognise it, are as the blind, 9^{39}. Judgment of this kind was only discrimination; by their own natures and capacities men were self-allotted to one of two groups. The separation was not outward or visible; no opposite flocks were ranged on right or left; but the distinction was real, and began to assert itself directly the new standard was raised. And so it came about that though the Son was not sent into the world to judge it, but to save it, 3^{17}, he became immediately the ground of

repeated declarations $6^{40\ 44\ 54}$, 'and I will raise him up at the last day,' which seem in the first case needless, for those who possess eternal life already will not need resurrection, and in the others positive intrusions into another context. They are the echoes of ^{39}; where the last clause with its awkward neuter pronoun 'it' has again the air of an insertion (for the idea of ^{39} cp. $17^{9\text{-}10\ 12}$). In 12^{48} suspicion of enlargement is again excited by the ascription of judgment to a sort of personification of Messiah's utterance: the inference from the comparison of ^{48a} with Luke 10^{16} would be that the judge was the 'Father which sent me.' ^{49}.

[1] 16^{8}, see *ante*, p. 441.

its judgment. Just as he said 'I am the resurrection,' he might have added 'I am the judgment.' For this was the judgment, that when the light came into the world, men liked the darkness better. There is no doom more terrible than not to love the highest when we see it.

Such are some of the contrasts which emerge on a comparison of the Fourth Gospel with its predecessors. Are they not largely due to reflection on the phases and meaning of early Christian experience, applied to the reinterpretation of the life and teaching of Christ? How far such a reinterpretation can be accepted as historical, is hardly to be settled by balancing items of external testimony, or even by reckoning up the signs of the author's acquaintance with Israel, its land, its customs, or its scriptures. Such knowledge cannot guarantee the accuracy of a spiritual portraiture on lines so different from those drawn for us by the earliest traditions. Its truth must stand or fall by its congruity with the only other presentation which history offers to us.

The author provides us with a reconstruction of the biography of Jesus, which exhibits the effects of Christianity in the light of the personality of Christ. Of that personality he supplies a new explanation. Taking up the Greek doctrine of the Logos, wrought into philosophic expression by Plato and the Stoics, and already applied in various ways in the schools of Hellenistic Judaism, he attaches

it to the conception of Messiah as Son of God. In brief pregnant sentences he summarises conceptions long familiar in the schools, and finally identifies them with the person of Jesus. Just as the Son of Sirach had described 'wisdom' as being with the Lord for ever, who poured her out upon all his works, *Ecclus.* $1^{1\,9}$,—alone she compassed the circuit of heaven, and walked in the depth of the abyss, 24^{5}—till her creator made her tabernacle in Jacob, 24^{8}, so did the Fourth Evangelist discern the indwelling Reason and the uttered Thought which constituted different aspects of the 'Word with God,' tabernacling in Jesus, *John* 1^{14}. By this conception the person and work of Jesus, considered as a manifestation of life, were related to the whole scheme alike of the universe and of human history. A common spiritual principle was seen to inform and maintain both worlds and souls. In modern language we might say that the ideal order of wisdom and might in sun and stars, the ideal order of righteousness in the associations of men, the ideal order of truth, beauty, goodness, love, within the heart, were all viewed as one; they were recognised as phases of one infinite energy, one everlasting thought, one eternal power, working through all and in all. The sages of Israel had identified Wisdom with the moral force binding communities together in social justice, and with the intellectual purpose knitting into harmony the parts and successions of the world around. The poet of the nineteenth century, with similar insight, identifies Duty, conceived as the 'stern

between the thought and the thinker, it could say in his name, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' In virtue of the same unity of experience between the disciple and his Lord, it could say 'Christ in us, and God in Christ, and we in God and Christ, that we may be perfected into one.'

LECTURE VIII.

THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH

THE study of the Bible by the historical method is now fairly established. Different investigators will naturally attach different values to the same evidence; difficult questions will be approached from varying points of view; not all students will have the same preconceptions respecting the significance of the letter of Scripture, the value of tradition, or the function of the Church. But with due allowance for these and other changing elements of judgment, it may be said broadly that the treatment of the Bible as a great literary record, side by side with similar products of antiquity, commands general (if not universal) assent.

The principle of interpreting the Bible 'like any other book' at once brings into view the resemblances which unite it to other deposits of ancient faith, and the differences which divide it from them. On the one hand we are made aware of its multiform character. Its contents are not all of one order. The Old Testament, for example, contains specimens of

many kinds of literature. History and lyric, the ancient legend, the folk-tale, the parable, the lofty oracles of the prophet, the religious debate, all find a place within its pages. The recognition of diversities of contents and style has fixed attention on the processes by which the books have reached their present form, and driven the student to investigate the materials out of which they have been composed. This has again and again resulted in profound modifications alike of our historic view and our theological beliefs. Theories once ardently cherished have been overthrown. Conceptions that had exerted immense influence for centuries, can no longer be maintained. Some doctrines—such as that of eternal punishment—have been widely abandoned in silence; others, like that of vicarious atonement, have been so transformed even in fifty years as to be hardly recognisable. On the other hand, the true value of the Bible has been enhanced. We have ceased to ask of it what it cannot give us; we cherish all the more highly what it can. Here is the testimony of men who have striven and suffered, men who have believed and hoped; and the power of their faith, their utterance, their character, shines out for us with more illustrious value in the great process of the divine education of the race, when it is compared and contrasted with similar witness from the great nations with which Israel was in turn associated. Babylonia and Egypt are among the teachers of Greece, and through Greece of modern Europe; each represents a religious culture

vastly older than that of Israel; but the immense literatures inscribed on temple and tomb beside the Nile, or buried among the ruined libraries beneath the mounds of Mesopotamia, might have remained for ever unread, and our spiritual life to-day would be no poorer. But we cannot imagine either our history or our religion without the Bible.

This general result is the product of many influences besides the literary enquiries which have been illustrated in the preceding lectures. It must suffice here to name three of the most prominent which have operated with special force during the last century, (1) the progress of science, (2) the discovery of the sources of much of the early story of human things related in the opening chapters of Genesis, and (3) the slow rise into our view of the Greater Bible of the entire race, supported on an enormous mass of primitive speculation concerning the origin of the world and the condition of man.

I.

When the nineteenth century opened, the Church had long come to terms with the Copernican theory of astronomy, and the Biblical view of the position of the earth as the centre of the universe, spread out upon the deep beneath the solid 'firmament' of the sky, had been frankly abandoned. The rising science of geology was exciting eager interest; and the difficulties of reconciling its discoveries with the Mosaic cosmogony had led pious students to suggest

that the fossils which appeared to indicate that the strata containing them had been deposited in the depths of the sea, had been really created in their actual places by a kind of Almighty sport. Theologians like Buckland[1] found another way out of the perplexities of the first chapter of Genesis by stretching the Mosaic 'days' into indeterminate periods of geologic time; or by supposing that a vast amount of creative activity shaping the crust of the earth lay unrecorded in the age preceding the appearance of organic life. The impossibility of harmonising a universal Deluge with the round earth of our knowledge[2] led to its contraction within the more limited regions open to the view of the Mosaic writer; while the accumulating evidence for the antiquity of man made the pedigree of the whole race from Adam and Eve more and more doubtful. The students of classical antiquity, like Niebuhr, Grote, and Sir George Cornwall Lewis, had 'revolutionised' (to quote the Bampton lecturer of 1859) 'the whole world of profane history'[3]:

'Time was—and that not very long ago—when all the relations of ancient authors were received with a ready belief; and an unreasoning and uncritical faith accepted with equal satisfaction

[1] Bridgewater Treatise, *Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology*, 1836, chap. ii: 'Consistency of Geological Discoveries with Sacred History.'

[2] For instance, the entire quantity of moisture in the world, if reduced to water, would not suffice to cover the surface of the globe above the highest mountains.

[3] The Rev. George Rawlinson, *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records*, p. 4.

between the First Man and the Second, between death in Adam, and life in Christ? That is the concern of theology. In his treatment of the ninth and tenth articles of the Church of England, Dr. Harold Browne proceeds on the assumption of the substantial truth of the common interpretation of the story of Genesis.[1] Adam and Eve were created innocent and holy; they gave, indeed, the only possible proof that they were not, by succumbing to the first temptation that came in their way; but though the expositor admits that the description of their fall is 'emblematical and mystical' rather than literal, he still argues that Adam brought in sin and death upon mankind.[2] One of the latest utterances of Oxford theology bravely maintains the same faith[3]:—

'The only relation which can at all directly compare with it [the relation of Jesus Christ to humanity], is that of Adam; who in a real—though a primarily external, and therefore inadequate—sense, was Humanity; so that every succeeding instance of humanity is human by direct derivation from him as very part and parcel of what he was. The reality and directness of our relation with Adam we feel only too cogently. . . . The nature, in and through which we live, is the nature which we have received through transmission from him.'

Is it not plain, however, that the doctrine of human nature must be taken out of its ecclesiastical form, and restated on the broader ground of anthropology? Must not the Churches frankly recognise that the conceptions of traditional theo-

[1] *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles.*

[2] *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. i. p. 49.

[3] Dr. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality* (1901), p. 88.

logy need to be reshaped in the light of present knowledge before they can seriously claim the attention of modern thinkers?[1]

Speculation concerning the origin of the world, the beginnings of human life, the cause of its hardness and suffering, the entry of death, the gradual progress of invention, the growth of the arts, has not been confined to Israel. As the records of other ancient nations have been examined, or the legends of the past have been gathered among the peoples of the lower culture, the themes of creation and cosmogony, of the character of primeval society, and the course of human affairs whether by advance or decline, are repeated with manifold variations. No story is more common all round the world in almost every continent than that of a Flood. Such narratives were at first welcomed, when they gradually became known, as confirmations of the Biblical narrative. But it is now recognised that that interpretation is possible no more. They are too numerous and too inconsistent with each other to be treated as different versions of a common event. And the modern conception of the continuity of the race—which can be traced both in Egypt and Babylonia with monumental evidence for some five thousand years B.C.[2]—disposes even of the more

[1] Earnest efforts have been made in this direction by writers like Archdeacon Wilson, in his book on the Atonement, and the Rev. R. F. Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*, Cambridge, 1902 (the Hulsean Lectures, 1901-2).

[2] For Egypt see Petrie in *Encycl. Brit.* vol. xxvii. (1902) p. 720: on Babylonia, Hommel in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 253. In the face of such facts it is almost incredible that an eminent geologist, the late Sir William Daw-

moderate plea that a 'portion of the earth, perhaps as yet a very small portion, into which mankind had spread, was overwhelmed by water.' Such was the position of Dr. Harold Browne in 1871.[1] In the following year Mr. George Smith, of the British Museum, published the first translation of the famous narrative of the Deluge which he had discovered among the cuneiform tablets in his charge.

Its effect was immediate. When the young English lieutenant, Henry Rawlinson, copied in 1837 the great trilingual inscription on the rocky face of Mount Behistun, which laid the foundation for the interpretation of different forms of cuneiform script, he did not foresee the immense consequences which would ensue. Little by little the key was applied to the materials collected with such patient toil by Botta, Layard, and others; and it began to be known that the mounds of Mesopotamia contained the libraries of buried cities possessing a civilisation, a religion, a literature, far older than those of Israel. The contents of these libraries

son, could argue that 'we had in *Gen.* vi.-viii., a narrative of a cataclysm which must have occurred about three thousand years before the Christian era, and contained in a document most simple and primitive in its style, which is yet so constructed that it provides beforehand against every objection urged against it by the most scientific and critical minds of the nineteenth century.' *The Historical Deluge* (Present Day Tracts, No. 76, issued by the Religious Tract Society. There is no date, but an authority of 1894 is quoted), p. 23. This catastrophe involved the submergence of Western Europe to about 2000 feet, and that of Western Asia to at least an equal amount, p. 35. 'The confirmation of the accuracy of this ancient record by independent discovery in modern times,' it is affirmed, p. 46, 'has a great evidential value in favour of the truth of the early Biblical history.' Lovers of the Bible are driven nearly to despair at finding an important religious Society willing to defend it on such grounds.

[1] *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. i. p. 77.

were slowly examined. There were historic annals and court summaries of royal achievements; there were the records of important astronomical observations; there were the transactions of banking-houses; there was an immense mass of hymns to the gods, and incantations of magic. Here were the clues to many of the names of ancient sanctuaries in Canaan; here were the roots of usages and beliefs which could be traced among the people of Israel. This had to some extent been dimly surmised by the pioneers of the new study. The discoveries of Mr. George Smith made it certain, and a whole band of explorers advanced into the field. The story of the Deluge was found to be an episode in the adventures of a hero, whose name is now read as Gilgames. The astronomical basis of its arrangement in twelve books suggested to Sir Henry Rawlinson that Gilgames was in some sense a representative of the sun-god. In the opinion of Prof. Sayce[1] his name means 'great Father,' and comes down from the earliest times before the pantheon of the gods was organised, and the world of living things was divided between 'spirits' and men. But the form in which the story of the Deluge was incorporated into the mythological collection gathered round Gilgames, has already been moralised. The Flood, in the ancient Babylonian version, is a punishment for sin, and the righteous man is saved.[2]

[1] *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, p. 432.

[2] Sayce, *ibid.* p. 439. For an account of the whole epic, see Jastrow, *The*

The origins of a narrative of which a modern writer can say that the event which it describes is 'the great dividing line in human history and in God's programme of the world's progress,'[1] are thus carried back to the mythology of ancient Babylonia. There, too, are the sources of many another representation in this group of traditions. The cosmogony of the first chapter has its roots in the same great deposit of early speculation; and the four rivers identify the Garden of Eden with Mesopotamia. No counterparts to Adam and Eve have, indeed, yet been discovered; but there was a garden and a sacred tree at Eridu, the Babylonian paradise in the plain of Eden.[2] The names of some of the figures which dimly intervene between Adam and Noah in *Gen.* 4 and 5, may be traced back to the same ancestry; Nimrod, too, may belong to the cycle of Gilgames, though his name has not yet been found in the texts[3]; and the tale of the tower that threatened to reach the sky, plainly arose among a group acquainted with the splendours of the great city of the Euphrates. Such are the mingled elements which have found their way into the Hebrew representations of the early courses of

Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, chap. xxiii.; further indications of the debt of Israel to Mesopotamian culture will be found in chaps. xxi., xxv., and xxvi. On the general subject cp. Pinches, *The Old Test. in the Light of the Historical Legends of Assyria and Babylonia* (1902).

[1] Dawson, *The Historical Deluge.*

[2] Edin was the Sumerian name of the plain of Babylonia, according to Sayce, *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, p. 385; cp. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 6.

[3] Cp. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 81.

mankind. A generation ago it was still possible for a conservative criticism to regard them as history. Now, it is possible no more. Sober students whose competence cannot be doubted, write of the Flood in such terms as these[1]:

'That the writers and compilers of Genesis sincerely believed the story we need have no doubt; but in the light of scientific and historical criticism it must be frankly recognised as one of those many stories or legends which are found in the folklore and early literature of all peoples.'

The distinguished Essayist of *Lux Mundi* who declared that 'there is nothing to prevent our believing, as our faith certainly strongly disposes us to believe, that the record from Abraham downward is in substance in the strict sense historical,'[2] left his readers to infer that the record from Abraham upward is not in substance in the strict sense historical. And yet the Established Church may upon occasion require its clergy to address the Maker of the universe with the amazing words: 'O Almighty Lord God, who for the sin of man didst once drown all the world, except eight persons'!

II.

The Old Testament, as it is now interpreted, tells the story of the rise and growth of a religion. The story extends through many hundred years;

[1] The Rev. F. H. Woods (of Oxford) in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 17.

[2] Dr. Gore, 'the Holy Spirit and Inspiration,' *Lux Mundi*, p. 351.

the religion takes up into itself numerous elements and undergoes profound transformations. In the New Testament the circumstances are different. The range of its composition is contracted from a possible millennium to a century. Its contents are far less varied; it deals not with the phases of the life of a nation, but with the career of a single Teacher, and the activities of his immediate followers. There is far less opportunity, therefore, it is sometimes urged, for the operation of the literary processes which may be traced so clearly in the elder books; nor is there room for the infusion of alien factors of thought which disturb the impression of historical reality. Yet the period is long enough for its primitive documents to have passed through successive stages, as in the case of our First and Second Gospels, or to have blended the materials of Hebrew and Christian thought in forms not wholly harmonious, as in the book of Revelation. It is long enough also for the interaction of outside forces. It was an age of eager movement, and it embraced one event of the utmost significance. It witnessed the transition of Christianity from its base in Judaism to the universalism of the second century. In time, no doubt, there was a far greater interval between the primitive traditions of Moses and the representation of his teaching in Deuteronomy, or between the delineation of David in the books of Samuel as the outlaw who afterwards created an empire and the Levitical saint of the Chronicler, than there is between the Jesus of the Synoptics

and the Messianic Son of God in John, or even (to take another memorable parallel) between the Socrates of Xenophon and the Socrates of Plato. There is a consequent disposition to withdraw the biographies of Jesus and the records of the Apostolic age from the field of historical criticism, to plead that they are exempt from its methods, and to place them under the shelter of the authority of the Church. What value, then, must be allowed for this sanction? Whence have we, after all, derived our Bible? By what process, or under what guarantee, did the books constituting its two great collections come together?

The Scriptures of Israel, as they were preserved in the Synagogue, comprised a three-fold growth, the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings.[1] Each of these divisions represents a double process; there is the origin of the books themselves, and their collection into a single group. The books of the Law, of Isaiah, of the Psalms, for instance, are well known to be composite. They are themselves collections, and these collections must have been substantially complete before they were aggregated into yet larger wholes. In the case of the Law, the modern view tells us that it cannot have been known in its present form until the publication of the Priestly Code under Ezra and Nehemiah in the year 444 B.C.[2] Opinion is, it is true, divided as to

[1] In the enumeration in *Luke* 24[44], 'the law, the prophets, and the psalms,' the last term stands for the whole third division, the psalms following the book of the Twelve prophets, and heading the final group of the 'Writings.'

[2] See Lect. III. p. 138.

whether the Book of the Law then produced comprised the older documents as well or not, in other words whether the amalgamation of **P** with **JED** had been already effected.[1] Even if it had been, the probability is still very strong that some additions were made subsequently. The actual editors of the Pentateuch, therefore, are unknown. We assume them to have been scribes at Jerusalem, acting possibly under the direction of Ezra before the fifth century ran out.[2] But their names and qualifications are altogether lost. The persons concerned, and their fitness for their task, have disappeared in obscurity. Yet it is upon them that the responsibility rests for the product which is offered to us as in some sense divinely distinguished from all other similar collections of old time.[3] In this dilemma we are referred to the Church.

'The claims of the Pentateuch to be the composition of Moses,' says a modern writer,[4] 'rest on no other grounds than the tradition of the Jews, and that tradition sprang out of the conjecture of certain obscure lawyers of the third century, B.C., whose very names are forgotten.'

The believer, however, need be under no apprehension. Faith can restore what criticism takes away.

'To the Hebrews,' it is affirmed,[5] 'was revealed the unity of

[1] See the discussion in the *Composition of the Hexateuch*, pp. 259-263.

[2] There is some evidence that expansions and repetitions took place even later still, *Composition of the Hexateuch*, pp. 345-6.

[3] The argument may be stated still more strongly in the case of the second and third divisions of the Old Testament Canon.

[4] Rev. S. Baring Gould, *Some Modern Difficulties* (1875), p. 113.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 141.

God, the fact of the creation of the world by God, and his providential government of mankind. This was their tradition, their creed revealed to them from of old. The Jewish Church was inspired to maintain this sacred deposit; and by virtue of its inspiration and in illustration of this revelation, it collected and preserved all such books as contained narratives of their history exemplifying God's providential government, and prophetic sayings which proved the continuousness of inspiration in the Church. By virtue of this inspiration those who returned from captivity recomposed in the Pentateuch the fragmentary records of their past. The work may have been that of ignorant lawyers, but for all that it was the work of an inspired Church, so that we do not receive the Old Testament writings on the authority of certain obscure scribes critically incompetent to perform their task efficiently, but on the authority of a Church animated by the Holy Ghost.'

Of the inspiration of this Church, controlling the work of its 'ignorant lawyers,' no proof is offered. How does the case, then, stand with the New Testament? Once more we are confronted with a long historic process; but it is conducted in a clearer light; and the motives and influences which guided it are more fully in view. The New Testament, like the Old, is the result of a selection from a wider literature. The origins of that literature lay in the circumstances of the early Church. Examine its first deposit, the earliest apostolic correspondence, and you will see how entirely occasional is its character. The letters of Paul arise out of the incidents of the young communities for whom he toiled. Their difficulties, their struggles, their disputes, their trials, their anxieties, are all reflected in these documents. They are not designed as expositions of Christian truth for all time; they bear emphatically the impress

of their day. The earliest notes of the teaching of Jesus by Matthew, the record by Mark of Peter's recollections, must have been due to analogous causes, the desire to preserve for special groups of believers the remembrance of Messiah's words and life. The Third Gospel was even written for a single person. That the apostolic or evangelic authors had no idea that they were contributing to a new body of Scriptures, is plain from the circumstance that they everywhere appeal for confirmation to the sacred books of the Synagogue; and the claims which they advance on behalf of Jesus are justified again and again out of prophecy and psalm. Paul reasons with the Jews at Thessalonica from the Scriptures, *Acts* 17^{2}; in Achaia Apollos confutes them, 'showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ,' 18^{28}. One other fact, indeed, suffices to prove that the conception of a new revelation for the permanent guidance of the Church could not have arisen among them. Most of the books comprised in our New Testament were written in the anticipation of the speedy return of Christ, the close of the existing age, and the inauguration of the 'age to come.'

But one generation after another passed away, and the heavenly Advent, expected at one time with such eagerness, did not occur. The Church continued to advance; its teaching tended to assume more and more definitely fixed types; it was obliged to adjust itself to the conditions of a world that would not be suddenly ended, but must be

gradually won for Christ; and it was further compelled to protect itself against the claims of rival pretenders to the possession of the truth. In the great conflict with the Gnostic schools of the second century the conception of a Christian tradition was wrought into definite shape. The Gnostic teachers professed to hold a secret doctrine, delivered by the Master privately to select disciples, and transmitted by them to their successors. This plea was inadequately met by an appeal to the documents in possession of the Church. They have been corrupted, retorted the Gnostics; and about 140 A.D. the heretical Marcion set the example of establishing a canon or 'rule' of truth by picking out the Third Gospel[1] and ten letters of Paul, to represent the Scriptural basis of his teaching. As the second century runs out, the counter-movement within the Church comes into view. The guarantee of the true faith is found in the tradition preserved in churches which had been founded by apostles. The apostles must be supposed to have imparted whatever was needful; their episcopal successors, it was assumed, had transmitted their teaching unimpaired; and their agreement, therefore, was a proof of its accuracy. This teaching was embodied in the two 'instruments,' the 'evangelic' and the 'apostolic,' which gathered into them the documents now recognised as authoritative; and it was summarised in the 'rule of faith' in which candidates for baptism were duly instructed. The evangelic collection comprised our

[1] This was further purged of what were supposed to be Jewish interpolations.

four Gospels, sifted out from a number of others, some of whose names have come down to us, such as those according to 'the Hebrews,' Peter, Thomas, and the like. The Book of Acts naturally followed the Third Gospel. Thirteen epistles of Paul were recognised; and the letters of *James*, 1 *Peter*, and 1 *John*. But the limits of the collection were by no means fixed. The Sinaitic codex contains the Epistle of Barnabas, and a large part of the 'Shepherd' ascribed to Hermas. In the Alexandrine manuscript (in the British Museum), known as A,[1] is found a copy of the precious Letter of Clement of Rome to the Church at Corinth,[2] together with a fragment of what used to be regarded as a second Letter, though it is now known to be a portion of an early homily. These writings did not succeed in permanently establishing themselves, and gradually fell into disuse. On the other hand some books now in our collection only acquired their position by degrees. Not all were equally acceptable everywhere. In some quarters the Apocalypse was regarded with disfavour; in others the Epistle to the Hebrews was suspected, or at least ignored. The minor letters of John, Jude, and 2 Peter, also, were slow in winning general recognition. The process of the formation of the Canon was naturally gradual; and when its main lines had been settled, the need for determining its outlying bounds was not urgent.

[1] See Lect. II., p. 60.

[2] The text is imperfect; but the whole was discovered by Bryennios in the Jerusalem MS. which contained the *Teaching of the XII. Apostles*, Lect. VI., p. 345.

The Council of Nicea (325 A.D.) did not find it necessary to define its contents. The first formal recognition of the collection as we have it, apart from the lists of individual writers, does not occur till the third council of Carthage, in the year 397 A.D. Our New Testament is thus the same as that of the North African Church at the end of the fourth century after Christ.

This brief recital will suffice to show that historically the New Testament comes to us through the Church. Is stress laid on the infallibility of Scripture? We must enquire, how was the decision in the case of any particular book finally reached? By what marks was it recognised as possessing this character, in virtue of which it was accepted, while others which had here and there secured admission were ultimately ejected? And what was the nature of the authority by which the Church guided the process and controlled the result? In whom was it vested, and how can it be recognised? The Church, we are assured, existed before a line of the Gospels or Epistles was written. It was already in possession of its inheritance of Christ's teaching; that teaching it has perpetuated ever since. The Church, therefore, is the guarantee of the Canon, which is due to its 'inspired prudence.'[1] The Church, that is to say, has chosen aright, and is supposed to owe that choice to special inspiration.

This claim is obviously endangered if it can be shown in any case that the Church has chosen amiss.

[1] The Rev. Leighton Pullan, *The Christian Tradition* (1902), p. 209.

That such a mishap has actually occurred in the case of the second Epistle of Peter is widely recognised. Its late date is indicated by its dependence on the Epistle of Jude; by its polemic against false teachers; by the differences of style marking it off from 1 Peter which the author has nevertheless employed; by its attempt to apologise for the delay in the expected *parousia*, and to answer the mockers who enquired 'Where is the promise of his coming?' and finally by its plea for a re-interpretation of the language of Paul. Dr. F. H. Chase is not likely to be regarded as a rash innovator, but his language is decisive[1]:—

'The only conclusion, it is believed, which is in accordance with the evidence, external and internal, is that 2 Peter is not the work of an apostle, but is a document which must be assigned to the second century.'

To such a verdict it is hardly adequate to reply[2]:—

'It must candidly be admitted that it is comparatively easy to assail the genuineness of this Epistle, yet a careful examination of each of the points raised by hostile criticism shows that not one of them is really strong.'

But if the Church has erred in one case, why not in another? A single instance of misascription really shatters the pretension of 'inspired prudence' raised on its behalf. If it might wrongly attribute a letter to one apostle, it might equally blunder in assigning a gospel to another.[3] But it is more to

[1] Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 816.

[2] Pullan, *The Christian Tradition*, p. 20.

[3] There is curious evidence that the Fourth Gospel was not received altogether without opposition. An obscure group known as the Alogi comes

the purpose to enquire on what, after all, is this plea of inspiration based? It rests ultimately, it would seem, on the very literature which it is invoked to accredit. The Bible is divine, it is urged, because the Church attests it. But how is the Church empowered to give this attestation? Because its chief teachers are guided by the Spirit. Where, then, is the proof of such guidance? It is found only in the very record itself. 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit,' says the risen Jesus, as he breathes on the Apostles, *John* 20^{22}. To say nothing of the colossal assumption that this gift was continued to their episcopal successors, it cannot be overlooked that the record is thus first summoned to guarantee the teaching authority of the Church. Scripture and Tradition thus in turn support each other. It is not usual for the foundations and the roof alternately to exchange places, and serve in each capacity in the same building. The inspiration claimed for the Church may really belong to it. But it cannot be

into view about 165 A.D. (Harnack), in Asia Minor; they seem to have been designated by this name from their rejection of the Doctrine of the Logos, and the Gospel in which it occurred: if the Johannine tradition had been absolutely stable, would this rejection have been possible? More remarkable is the fact that Gaius, a learned writer of the church at Rome, raised objections to it at the opening of the third century, to which Hippolytus replied.—The possibility of erroneous literary ascription has received ample illustration in our own country; for example in the seventeenth century, *Eikon Basilikē* was widely attributed to the 'royal martyr,' though the Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Gauden, confessed his authorship. The 'Christian Paradoxes,' published in 1648 in a volume of 'Remains' of Bacon, were assigned to him in repeated editions and by numerous critics, till Dr. Grosart showed in 1865 that they had appeared under the name of their proper author, Dr. Palmer of Cambridge, in 1645, and had gone through several editions both before and after their incorporation in Bacon's works. See Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority*, pp. 177-8.

the Parsees the adventurous Anquetil du Perron brought precious manuscripts, among which was a copy of the venerable text known in the West as the Zend Avesta (of which du Perron published a translation in 1771), containing the colloquies of the prophet Zoroaster with Ahura Mazda, the Lord all-knowing. In 1799 the discovery of the Rosetta stone supplied the key to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and during the last half century the hymns and prayers of ancient Egypt, the mysteries of the progress of the soul through the regions of the dead, and its solemn judgment in the Hall of the Two Truths before Osiris, have been laid open from the rocky tombs to the light of day. The recovery of the records of the ancient empires of Mesopotamia has been already described. In ancient Greece, too, the beginnings of similar literature were not wanting; collections of its sacred oracles were made; and the utterances of ancient seers were gathered for the use of believers.

In these several groups the idea of Revelation is repeatedly present. The beginnings of law and religion are everywhere divine. On the walls of the temple of Edfu were inscribed the books of Thoth, embodying the sacred knowledge which the son of Rā (but also 'the unborn,' the 'one God,' the 'alone only One'), had deigned to impart to man. Nebo, son of Marduk, is the Babylonian prophet-god, *ilu tasmîtu* 'god of revelation' ('causing to hear'), source of all inspiration and learning. The Angel of the Sacred Law of Zoroaster was believed to have

been produced by Vohu Mano, the 'Good Mind' of Ahura,[1] along with the light of the world, and she dwelt in the heavenly house. Issuing from the Lord Omniscient, the Law bore the title of the 'Holy Word';[2] and its most ancient elements, the sacred verses known as Gāthās, possessed such sanctity that they were the objects of actual worship.[3] The early Buddhist Scriptures make no claim to be themselves of supernatural origin. They are produced, according to their own statements, in the course of events which followed the death of the Teacher whose instructions they report.[4] But they do claim to be a faithful record; and the word of the Buddha, the 'enlightened,' the all-knowing, is perfect and unerring truth. Moreover, the Buddha founded an Order or Union for the diffusion and maintenance of his message of deliverance. He was its centre for a whole generation. He witnessed its growth; he promoted its extension; he gave it an elaborate body of rules; hundreds and thousands of disciples were received into it during his life-time. He repeated his teachings again and again during long wanderings in the Ganges Valley; on his death-bed he bade his followers find in them their stay and support. He was even believed to have foreseen the possibility that error might arise in the exposition of the truth or

[1] *Bundahish*, i. 25, in *Sacred Books of the East*, v. p. 9.

[2] *S. B. E.*, iv. p. 207.

[3] *Yasna*, lv., *S. B. E.* xxxi. p. 294.

[4] On the period to which they really belong see the introduction by Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids to his translation of the Dīgha Nikāya, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, vol. i.

the sacred rules of the discipline, and to have provided for a comparison of such teachings with the traditions preserved in the two great groups of discourse and of regulations known as *Sutta* and *Vinaya*.[1] Yet the Christian student, approaching an alien Scripture with his own preconceptions, has no hesitation in rejecting a claim thus carefully guarded.

More striking still is the analogy presented by the faith which gathered around the ancient hymns of the Rig Veda. In one of the latest poems in the collection[2] they are traced to a divine source in the mystical sacrifice of the Cosmic Man, *Purusha*, from which, in fact, the whole creation was derived. In this view the Veda belonged to another realm than that of space and time. Its true home was in the ideal world, which was not liable to change or decay, the world of the 'deathless,' where there were no bounds or limits, so that it might be called 'un-ending' *(an-anta)* or infinite. In that world the hymns had been 'seen' by the ancient sages, to whom they were traditionally assigned. But they were not, in truth, of human authorship. They were transcripts from the eternal. Immense philosophical ingenuity was expended on the defence of this conception of their heavenly origin.[3] The Veda, it was argued, shone by its own light; it was admitted by age-long tradition; it was accepted in

[1] See the Mahā-Parinibbāna Sutta, in *S. B. E.*, xi. p. 67.

[2] *Rig Veda*, x. 90, 9.

[3] Cp. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. iii. chap II. §§ 7-12.

common experience. Subtle reasonings were devised to account for the expression of everlasting ideas in a particular human language, or for the mention of actual objects such as the rivers of a specific geographical locality, or for the existence of different recensions of the sacred texts. The doctrine of the ideal and eternal character of the Veda naturally led to that of the special illumination of the sages who were the human media of their communication to men. Indian theology formulated no conception like that of the Old Testament by which the Spirit of Yahweh clothed itself with a human personality,[1] putting it on like a garment; nor did it employ the prophetic symbol of the 'word of Yahweh,' or the Greek figure of the entrance of deity into the chamber of the soul, so that the believer became *entheos*, and was rapt by the God within him into exalted states of 'enthusiasm.' But the Veda, as eternal, was inerrant or infallible; and this character was not forfeited or even impaired by its passage from its home above the realms of succession and decay into the midst of our mortal life. It was in the charge of the Brahmans who had themselves issued from the mouth of the mystic Purusha[2]; it had been preserved by them in unbroken tradition. The Law-book of Manu could proudly affirm[3]:—

'The Veda is the eternal eye of the manes [the departed

[1] *Judges* 6^{34} (margin, R.V.).; 1 *Chron.* 12^{18}; 2 *Chron.* 24^{20}.

[2] *Rig Veda*, x. 90, 12.

[3] xii. 94, 99; *S.B.E.* xxv. p. 504.

fathers], gods, and men: the Veda-ordinance (is) both beyond the sphere of (human) power, and beyond the sphere of (human) comprehension; that is a certain fact.

'The eternal lore of the Veda upholds all created beings.'

How can such claims be disproved by arguments which are not equally applicable if urged by a Hindu against similar pretensions which may be raised on behalf of the Bible? Each depends upon a tradition; the criticism which is passed on the East by the West does not become illegitimate when the positions are reversed. Will you rest the exclusive inspiration of the Bible on the manifest superiority of its contents? It will be hard to maintain your plea, so as to justify you in assigning to one a purely human origin and tracing the other to a source that is nothing but divine. Constantly in the sacred literatures of the world you will be confronted with an essential similarity in moral and religious experience; the same problems arise; the prayers and aspirations of the devout soul may be clothed in a different idiom, but they are intrinsically alike. The Hebrew poet, with the vivid imagery of his native land, expresses his yearning for the rest and security of faith in the cry, 'Lead me to the rock that is higher than I.' The Brahman shares the same longing, but his vocabulary depends rather on his more abstract philosophy than on the scenery before his eyes: 'Lead me from the unreal to the real; lead me from darkness to light; lead me from death to the deathless.'[1] Can we affirm that one petition is

[1] Sacrificial Verses (*Yajus*) quoted in the *Bṛihad Āranyaka*, i. 3. 29, in *S. B. E.* xv. p. 83.

more prompted of heaven than the other? 'Eye for eye, tooth for tooth,' ran the maxim of primitive jurisprudence, incorporated in the Levitical code[1]; 'as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be rendered unto him.' Very different were the precepts of the Indian sage, a generation or more before Ezra and his helpers compiled and published their legislation:[2]

'Let a man leave anger, let him forsake pride, let him overcome all bondage. He who holds back rising anger like a rolling chariot, him I call a real driver; other people do but hold the reins.

'Let a man overcome anger by love; let him overcome evil by good[3]; let him overcome the greedy by liberality, the liar by truth.

'He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me, in those who harbour such thoughts, hatred will never cease.

'For hatred does not cease by hatred at any time. Hatred ceases by love.'

Are we not here nearer to the spirit of Jesus? And if so, may we not say of the heavenly Wisdom that 'from generation to generation passing into holy souls she maketh *men* friends of God and prophets'?[4]

III.

A signal instance of the dependence of Christian doctrine on the tradition and authority of the Church will be found in the pleas now raised in support of the clause in the 'Apostles' Creed' defining the

[1] *Leviticus* 24^{20}. [2] *Dhammapada*, 221-223; 3-4; *S. B. E.* pp. 58, 4.
[3] Cp. *Romans* 12^{21}. [4] *Wisdom of Solomon* 7^{27}.

mode by which Jesus entered human life—'Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary.' How does this belief, which has been described as the 'foundation stone of Christianity,' present itself in the light of modern knowledge?

The belief is, of course, founded upon the narratives of the birth of Jesus prefixed to the accounts of his ministry in the First and Third Gospels. They have been discussed from various points of view for more than a century.[1] Can it be said that the discussion has reached any definite result?

In the first place it must be noted that the two narratives are not only independent, they are really conceived on different lines. Both, indeed, agree in placing the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem; and it may further be inferred that Luke like Matthew assigned it to the reign of Herod the Great.[2] But at that point resemblance ceases. Of the birth of John, of the relationship between Mary and Elizabeth, of the

[1] The first serious criticism in this country proceeded from Priestley, in his *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ* (1786), Book III, chap. xx. (*Works*, vol. vii). He refers to 'a small tract of Mr. Elwall's, written about 60 years ago, the design of which was to disprove it. It made no impression on me at the time, and I have not been able to procure it since.' Schleiermacher in his Essay on Luke (*ante* Lect. I. p. 16) treated the two first chapters of the Third Gospel as embodying materials of poetry: Strauss in his two successive 'Lives' handled the stories as mythical. Keim analysed them at length in his *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. ii. A short summary of the difficulties will be found in the *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed. (1890), pp. 141-163; a more recent discussion is given by Prof. Percy Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica* (1899), chap. xix. Dr. Gore devoted to the same subject the first of his *Dissertations connected with the Incarnation* (1895); and Dr. Sanday has briefly treated it in his article on 'Jesus Christ,' in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. See on the other side Usener on 'the Nativity' in *Encycl. Bibl.*, and Schmiedel on 'Mary.'

[2] *Luke* 1[5].

home in Nazareth, Matthew says no word. He apparently regards Bethlehem as the residence of Joseph, 2^{11}; and when Joseph settles in Nazareth with Mary and the infant Jesus [23], it is evidently for the first time. The census which is the occasion, according to Luke, of the journey of the pair to Bethlehem, is consequently unnamed; it has nothing to do with the story. In place of Luke's country shepherds gathering round the manger in the inn-stable, Matthew reports the arrival of a train of Magi from the east,[1] bringing royal gifts of gold and frankincense and myrrh, and offering their homage to the new-born 'King of the Jews' in his mother's house. To fulfil the prophecy 'Out of Egypt did I call my son,' the babe is conveyed thither on the warning of an angel to Joseph in a dream, 2^{13-15}. The death of Herod is the signal for a similar intervention to secure the child's return to the land of Israel [19-21]; but a third vision is needed to fix him at Nazareth [22-23], which from that time becomes his home.[2]

The sequence of Luke is entirely different. Joseph and Mary are only visitors at Bethlehem; they have no house, and seek lodging in the village caravanserai. There, apparently, they remain about six weeks,[3] till the days of 'purification' were fulfilled. The proper offerings are made in the temple;

[1] There is no reason for limiting them to three.

[2] Apparently to fulfil a prophecy the origin of which cannot be discovered.

[3] *Lev.* 12 reckons forty days: on temple-usage see Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, ii. p. 81.

under the shadow of Herod's palace the babe is greeted, not by foreign sages but by a devout Jew, as the whole world's Messiah, glory of Israel and light to the Gentiles. There is no hint of danger from the reigning king; the dreams that warn the actors in Matthew's story play no part in Luke; an exquisite serenity pervades the narrative as the venerable Simeon and the devout Anna unite to give thanks; and the parents then return to Galilee, 'to their own city Nazareth,' 2^{39}. The motive of prophecy, so often employed by Matthew (1^{22} $2^{5\ 15\ 17\ 23}$), nowhere appears; but the child is carefully brought within the fulfilment of the Law. Is it surprising that when it is asked whether these narratives are not 'incompatible,' the reply should be, 'They are indeed incompatible in certain details as they stand.'[1]

To which of these accounts, then, is credibility to be attached, seeing that in the form in which we have them they cannot both be true? The narrative of Matthew exhibits no real points of contact with history, by which it can be tested, save the mention of Herod. There is no trace either of such an incident as the visit of the Magi guided by a

[1] So Dr. Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation* (1895), p. 36. It is added that 'the incompatible elements are explicable quite easily by the use which the Evangelists made of the earlier documents upon which they relied.' Of the contents of these documents, however, or even of their existence, we know nothing. They can hardly, therefore, be invoked in explanation. It is important, nevertheless, that the presence of 'incompatible elements' should be recognised by a high authority. Dr. Westcott believed that 'the separate details are exactly capable of harmonious adjustment,' *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (6th ed. 1881), p. 319.

travelling star, or of the subsequent massacre of the children at Bethlehem. The frequent recurrence of the angel and the dream has no counterpart in the rest of the Gospel[1]; and the emphasis on the fulfilment of prophecy discloses the secret of the writer's thought. Luke, on the other hand, takes pains to connect the story with the political demands of imperial Rome: but in the judgment of the profoundest students of Roman affairs his attempt does not seem successful. The governorship of Quirinius, the decree of Augustus, the extension of an enrolment to the dominions of Herod, were all alike doubtful. Twenty years ago the historian Mommsen declared that no one cognisant of the facts could believe that any census was carried out by the Romans at that time, 'whatever theologians, or those who, like theologians, talk in bonds, may have persuaded themselves or others.'[2] The indefatigable labours of Prof. Ramsay, however, have enabled him to raise anew the question, 'Was Christ born at Bethlehem?' A series of delicate combinations leads to the following suggestions[3]: (1) Evidence has come to light in Egypt that periodic enrolments were made at intervals of fourteen years, the earliest

[1] For the dream, however, compare the late story of Pilate's wife, 27^{19}.

[2] *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (2nd ed. 1883), pp. 168, 176.

[3] *Expositor*, 1897, i. pp. 274-286, 425-435, and *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898). More material is also available in the papyri from Egypt published by Mr. Kenyon, and by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. See the new evidence discussed by Schürer in the last edition of his *Gesch. des Jüdischen Volkes* (1901), vol. i. pp. 510-543; and compare the remarks of Prof. Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, pp. 253-4.

document of this type at present discovered belonging to A.D. 20; there is reason to trace this back to Augustus: (2) The uniformity of Roman administration makes it probable that such enrolments were held in other parts of the empire, and thus there may have been one in Syria in B.C. 8: (3) The kingdom of Herod was reckoned as belonging to the empire; and though in his dominions the enrolment would not be carried out by a Roman officer, Herod probably felt obliged to execute it under pain of the displeasure of Augustus; but he may have sent an embassy to Rome to beg for exemption, and this may have caused a postponement of the actual operation till B.C. 6:[1] (4) In executing the imperial plan, Herod would conciliate Jewish opinion by following national usage, and this may have required that Joseph should report himself at the birthplace of an ancestor a thousand years before, and that his wife should accompany him on the journey[2]: (5) When this took place, Quinctilius Varus was governor of Syria; but Augustus may have sent Quirinius as a special lieutenant to assist Varus (who had no experience in war) in the conduct of certain military

[1] It is rather remarkable in this connexion to find Kepler's calculations concerning the conjunction of the three planets Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars, adduced as a coincidence 'worthy of mention,' though 'not presented as an argument,' p. 216.

[2] To what tribe Mary belonged is doubtful. In *Luke* 1^{27} to whom do the words 'of the house of David' apply? The general style of the verse (cp. 2^{4}) suggests Joseph: and this is admitted to be most natural by Weiss, *Mk.-Luk.* (1901), p. 277. In that case it may be inferred that Mary was not supposed to be of Davidic lineage. But Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 2957, seems to be too positive in asserting (on the ground of 1^{36}) that as kinswoman of a Levite the author of *Luke* 1 certainly regarded her as a Levite.

operations, especially against the Homonadenses. It cannot be said that this pile of hypotheses does more than establish a very slender probability for the visit of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem. But it does positively nothing to establish the miracle of the Virgin-birth. As Prof. Ramsay remarks,[1] 'Obviously, the truth of the story in Luke i., ii., can can never be demonstrated. There will always remain a large step to be taken on faith.'

From another point of view, however, the narrative of Luke is exposed to serious difficulty. The Gospel speaks of 'his father and his mother,' 2^{33}; 'his parents,' 2^{41}; Mary says 'thy father and I,' 2^{48}. The Davidic pedigree of Jesus is traced through Joseph, 3^{23};[2] and with this agrees the early reading apparently preserved in the Sinaitic-Syrian, 2^{5}, 'with Mary his wife.'[3] The same authority concludes the genealogy in *Matt.* 1^{16} with the following remarkable statement:—

> Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus, who is called the Christ.

The publication of this text in 1894 attracted widespread attention.[4] Further evidence was supplied by Mr. F. C. Conybeare in 1898 that the genealogy of Matthew originally ended, 'And Joseph begat

[1] *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* p. 112.

[2] With the harmonistic explanation 'as was supposed.'

[3] Mrs. Smith Lewis, *Translation of the Four Gospels*, etc., 1894. Cp. Usener, art. 'Nativity,' *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 3349-50.

[4] See the correspondence in the *Academy*, Nov. 1894, and onwards.

Jesus who is called Christ.'[1] The authors of the pedigrees, therefore, regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph, like the townspeople of Nazareth, *Matt.* 13^{55}, or the Jews by the sea of Galilee, *John* 6^{42}; and the genealogies seem to have been editorially adapted to their present position.

Before these textual facts came to light, however, a fresh suggestion had been made with respect to Luke's narrative. The only reference to the Virgin-birth in the Third Gospel occurs in $1^{34\text{-}35}$. Does that passage, after all, asked Dr. Hillmann,[2] belong to the original story? does it not disturb the context, and may it not be cast out as an intrusion? This view has since received weighty adhesions.[3] On what grounds is it supported? The reference to Elizabeth in ^{36} certainly seems to follow better on ^{33}. In that passage, moreover, the child whose birth is announced, is already designated Messianically as 'Son of the Most High';[4] but the title 'Son of God' in ^{35} has a quite different signification; it denotes not official adoption, but actual origin: ^{35} is thus a doublet of $^{31\text{-}2}$ on another plane. Moreover, the incredulity of Mary concerning the possibility of motherhood ^{34}, seems inexplic-

[1] See *the Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1902, p. 100, and Jan. 1903, p. 355.

[2] *Jahrb. für Prot. Theologie*, 1891, pp. 213-231.

[3] Harnack, *Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1901, pp. 53-57; Holtzmann, *Hand-commentar*, 1901; Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 2nd ed. vol. i., p. 407; Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 2956; Usener, *Enc. Bibl.* iii. 3349: cp. Wernle, *Synoptische Frage*, p. 103.

[4] Cp. *Mark* 14^{61}.

able in one already betrothed; yet it does not (like that of Zacharias [18-20]) expose her to rebuke or penalty; the doubt seems introduced only to give occasion for the explanation in [35]. The real reply of Mary to the original announcement [30-32 36-37], follows in [38], 'be it unto me according to thy word,' and her submission to the heavenly will wins the blessing of Elizabeth [42]. It must be confessed that there is much that is attractive about this bold suggestion; and it at once harmonises the story in *Luke* 1 with the view in 2 that Mary was Joseph's wife, and that he was the father of Jesus. Neither of the two narratives, it may be added, could have been known to Mark. It is incredible that the mother, who alone possessed the secret of his birth, could have joined his brothers in endeavouring to put him under restraint on the ground that he was mad,[1] *Mark* $3^{21\,31}$.

The stories of the Virgin-birth are not only, however, inconsistent with each other, with the genealogies, and with the tenor of the rest of the Evangelic representations, they are also really incompatible with the meaning of the divine words at the Baptism. Mark, who relates no wondrous entry into the world, depicts Jesus as endowed for his high function by

[1] This statement is omitted by *Matth.* 12^{46} and *Luke* 8^{19}. Mr. Pullan, *The Christian Tradition*, p. 10, thinks that S. Mark 'possessed little or no attraction for Christians immediately after the apostolic age. When all the eye-witnesses of the ministry of Christ were dead, orthodox Christians wanted most of all something which helped them in preaching the Gospel, it did not particularly help them to know that our Lord's relatives once thought him mad,' etc. Evidently, the inconvenient testimony of the earliest Gospel is to be disparaged because it does not support a more developed orthodoxy. But in that case, what becomes of its inspiration?

the descent of the Spirit on his coming up out of the Jordan, $1^{10\text{-}11}$; when the heavenly voice declares—

Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.

This, then, according to the earliest Synoptic tradition, is the moment when Jesus becomes the Messianic Son of God. This was the true 'Epiphany,' the manifestation of God upon earth, in which the Church long commemorated the double festival of the baptism and the birth of Christ.[1] The testimony of the Third Gospel (according to one important tradition) was even stronger: for in *Luke* 3^{22} the famous codex of Beza applies to Jesus the words of *Psalm* 2^{7}—

Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.

In this form it is quoted from the 'Memoirs of the Apostles' by Justin; it is cited by Clement and by Origen; Lactantius and Hilary confirm it; Faustus the Manichean and Augustine the orthodox both employ it.[2] This can be harmonised with the language of 1^{33}, but not with the announcement of ^{35}; and the suggestion that this latter is really an addition to the story thus receives some additional support.

That the doctrine was not within Paul's view may be inferred from the terms in which he describes Jesus as 'born of the seed of David according to the flesh,' but 'determined [or 'defined'] to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of

[1] Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, i. (1889).

[2] Usener, *ibid.* pp. 40-45. Other forms of the divine utterance are cited in the *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed., p. 166.

holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.'[1] Neither with the Virgin-birth, nor with the heavenly voice at the baptism, does he seem acquainted. It is difficult to suppose (with Usener[2]) that the story was unknown to the Fourth Evangelist[3]; it appears more likely, as Prof. Gardner interprets the signs, that he wished to convey a protest against it.[4] When he ascribes to Jesus such sayings as 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing,' or 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh,' he strives to lift the question of origins on to another plane, where a miracle of physical generation is altogether out of place.

On the other hand, we can no longer ignore the fact that the idea of a wondrous birth without human fatherhood appears in a multitude of tales which can be traced literally round the world 'from China to Peru.'[5] The incidents of folk-lore are doubtless unsuitable for comparison with narratives like those in our Gospels; they are part of a common stock of imaginative material reproduced without purpose or authority from age to age and land to land, destitute of historic significance. But they are the founda-

[1] *Romans* 1^{3-4}. The words of *Psalm* 2^{7} are apparently applied in *Acts* 13^{33} to the resurrection.

[2] *Encl. Bibl.* iii. 3347.

[3] It is commonly admitted that he used both Matthew and Luke, see *ante*, Lect. VII. p. 398.

[4] *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 239.

[5] Miraculous conception of the founder of the house of Chow, *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iii. p. 397: cp. another story of the wondrous birth of the founder of the house of Shang, *ibid.* p. 307. Peru, cp. Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, i. p. 118-9.

tion of other cases which cannot be dismissed so lightly; the wide-spread acceptance of the folk-tale supplies a form for more serious doctrine. The idea appears already under the Middle Empire of ancient Egypt[1]; and earlier still the kings of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties called themselves sons of the sun-god. In the case of Amon-hotep III. (of the Eighteenth Dynasty) it was wrought out with amazing realism on a wall of the temple of Luxor. Amon himself[2] descended from heaven and stood beside the virgin who should become a mother[3]:

'Amon-hotep,' he is made to say, 'is the name of the son who is in thy womb. He shall grow up according to the words that proceed out of thy mouth. He shall exercise sovereignty and righteousness in this land unto its very end. My soul is in him, (and) he shall wear the twofold crown of royalty, ruling the two worlds like the sun for ever.'

This is only the natural sequel of the language in which again and again the Egyptian kings are described as filially related to a paternal god. Tahutmes IV.[4] paid great honour to the sun-god Ra in the form of Harmachis. To this deity the Sphinx at Gizeh was dedicated,[5] and Tahutmes cleared its vast form of the accumulations of the

[1] Sayce, *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, p. 49[1].

[2] To Amon are dedicated some of the noblest of the Egyptian hymns. He is 'lord of eternity, Maker everlasting'; from his eyes proceed mankind, of his mouth are the gods; he is maker of grass for the cattle, and of fruitful trees for men, 'lying awake when all men sleep to seek out the good of his creatures'; see C. W. Goodwin, *Records of the Past*, ii. 129.

[3] Sayce, *ibid.* p. 249.

[4] 1423-1414 B.C., Petrie, *History of Egypt*, vol ii. (1896), p. 166.

[5] A hymn to Ra-Harmachis is translated by Dr. E. L. Lushington in *Records of the Past*, viii. p. 131.

desert sand in memory of a noon-day dream beneath its shadow, when he had rested there once during the chase in his youth:

'A rest he made in the shadow of this god, sleep fell upon him, dreaming in slumber in the moment when the sun was overhead. Found he the majesty of this noble god, talking to him by his mouth, speaking like the talk of a father to his son, saying, Look thou at me! Behold thou me! My son Tahutmes, I am thy father, Hor-em-akht, Khepra, Ra, and Tum, giving to thee the kingdom. On thee shall be placed its white crown and its red crown, on the throne of Seb the heir. There is given to thee the land in its length and in its breadth, which is lightened by the bright eye of the universal lord. . . Draw near, and behold I am with thee.'[1]

A little later, Rameses the Great is engaged in his campaign against the Hittites of Syria; and the court-scribe Pentaüra describes his appeal to the great Theban deity Amun-ra in the crisis of battle[2]:

'Shouldst thou be my father, O Amun? And, behold, should a father forget his son? Have I then put my trust in my own thoughts? Have I not walked according to the word of thy mouth? Has not thy mouth directed my marches, and have not thy counsels guided me? Amun will bring low them that know not God.'

The religious motive in such passages as these is transparent. Of course it may be dismissed as insincere or conventional. But the analogy to modes of thought in the line of Israel's development is strongly marked. And the transition from

[1] Jacob dreams at night, *Gen.* $28^{11\text{-}16}$, and receives a similar promise of land for himself and his seed, with a similar declaration of divine protection ^{15}, 'and behold I am with thee.' But no paternal care is here implied, as in the case of David, 2 *Sam.* 7^{14} 'I will be his father, and he shall be my son.'

[2] Tiele, *History of the Egyptian Religion* (1882), p. 152.

the conception of a divine Fatherhood endowing the royal son with dominion to that of positive paternity takes place with a bold literalness before our eyes on the walls of Luxor in a manner which shows how easily symbols might be converted into facts. May we not believe that a similar conversion was effected in a nobler form by early Christian imagination ?[1]

In truth, however, it is frankly recognised that this doctrine does not really rest upon historic evidence.[2] It enters the believer's mind by an act of faith. If it be enquired on what this faith is founded, some may answer, 'the Scripture record.' With

[1] If it be replied (as, for example by Prof. Sanday, Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 647) that there was not time for such a transition in view of the newer dates assigned to the Gospels, it may be observed that the report that Plato was the son of Apollo was circulated in Athens during his life-time, and was sufficiently important for his nephew Speusippus expressly to deny it at his uncle's funeral, cp. *First Three Gospels*, 2nd ed. p. 160, and Origen, *Against Celsus*, i. 37. For the similar case of Augustus, cp. *First Three Gospels*, p. 160, and Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 241-2. When Dellius, the friend of Antony came into Judea, he was so much struck with the beauty of Herod's wife Mariamne and her brother Aristobulus, grandchildren of the high priest Hyrcanus, that he began to 'talk portents' and complimented their mother by the suggestion that they were not of human birth, but from some god, Josephus, *Antiquities*, xv. 2, 6. A remarkable story is related by the historian Justin, xv. 4, of the birth of Seleucus (afterwards the founder of Antioch) whose mother Laodice, though married to Antiochus, received a visit from Apollo. The god left his pledge in the shape of a ring (afterwards found in the bed), on which was engraved an anchor! The thigh of Seleucus, and the same limb of his sons and grandsons, all bore the image of an anchor. Such were the tales of Syria. As the term 'Spirit' is feminine in Hebrew, it is not likely that the Christian story arose on Jewish soil; its use in *Luke* 1^{35} is not Palestinian any more than 'virgin' in *Matt.* 1^{23}, which is derived from the Greek version of the Old Testament Scriptures made at Alexandria. In the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, ed. E. B. Nicholson, the Spirit addresses Jesus as 'My son' and he in turn speaks of 'My mother the holy Spirit,' pp. 43, 74.

[2] The candid testimony of Prof. Ramsay has already been cited.

that plea we have already dealt. The student who realises that the Scripture record is inconsistent with itself can no longer accept it as a whole. He may select what he finds most congruous with his general scheme of thought, but he cannot refuse the same right to others. Those who believe that Joseph was the father of Jesus have the authority of the Gospels as fully as those who ascribe his birth to the direct intervention of the Holy Spirit. There is, however, another alternative. The same judgment which pronounces the narratives of Matthew and Luke 'incompatible in certain details as they stand,' falls back for the justification of faith on the authority of the Church[1]:—

'Considering the position which the Virgin-birth holds in the creeds, it cannot be denied that the authority of the Church is committed to it as a fact beyond recall. To admit that its historic position is really doubtful would be to strike a mortal blow at the authority of the Christian Church as a guide to religious truth in any real sense. Such a result is in itself an argument against the truth of any position which would tend to produce it.'

But criticism, if it is once admitted into the Scriptures, cannot be restrained from investigating tradition. It will ask what is the authority of the Church? In whom is it vested? How is its scope defined? By what marks may it be recognised? What proofs can it offer of its claims? And to these and other questions of like character it will get various answers, from Jerusalem to Nicea, to Rome, to Geneva, to Canterbury. Moreover, it will point out that the New Testament presents various

[1] Dr. Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 67.

conceptions of the person of Jesus. There is the Synoptic type represented in its earliest form by Mark, which exhibits Jesus as the Messiah who preached the kingdom of God and healed the sick, so that Peter could tell (*Acts* 10^{38}) 'how that God anointed him with holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good.' There is the Pauline type, according to which Jesus is interpreted no longer 'according to the flesh,' but as the Second Man, the Man from heaven, first born of the spiritual creation, and identified in express terms with the Spirit, 2 *Cor.* 3^{17}. And there is the Johannine type, depicting Jesus as the Word become flesh, living in mystic unity with the Father and with his disciples, so that all share a common fellowship, the true centre of which is no more on earth but in a realm beyond the relations of space, though it may be accommodated to our conceptions as 'above.' We need not now ask whether these three representations can be reconciled; it is enough to observe that here are the fountain-heads of the Christian tradition, and none of them names the Virgin-birth. If there are any other founders of the Church more eminent than Peter, Paul, and 'John,' it were well that we should know them. As long as we are in error with them, we are not far from safety.

Follow the streams of tradition into the second century, and you will find that it flows in divers channels and has various representatives. The fathers are feeling their way towards new modes of interpreting the word and work of Jesus. There is

no fixed orthodoxy. Germs of thought are expanding in different directions. Tendencies of speculation meet in stubborn conflict. The advancing exaltation of the person of Jesus drives earlier conceptions of his nature into remote corners; they survive in a sort of underground life, to emerge into light in the heresies of later days, when strange and obscure sects unexpectedly reproduce some primitive aspect of the early faith. But in the midst of the confusion the voice of Harnack is heard saying with unfaltering decision[1]:—

'It is one of the best established results of history that the clause "Born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary" does not belong to the earliest Gospel preaching.'

About the year 243-2 B.C.,[2] the great Asoka, so often called the Constantine of Buddhism, visited the reputed birthplace of the Buddha (who had been born some three centuries before), and recorded his homage in an inscription. He had learned from his teachers who held the sacred tradition, that the future Buddha had descended from the Tusita heaven, and had become miraculously incarnate in his mother's womb. At his birth a wondrous light appeared; the shining devas sang and made music in heaven; and the whole system of ten thousand worlds quivered in sympathy. The Brahmans on his name-day predicted his future glory; and the sage

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1893, p. 170.

[2] The twenty-first of Asoka's reign, see the inscription of the Rummindei pillar, Vincent Smith, *Asoka*, p. 145. The year is uncertain, owing to some slight doubt as to the date of his accession: see Miss Duff's *Chronology of India*, p. 11. The inscription was discovered in December, 1896.

Asita, when he received the babe in his arms, announced that he would establish the kingdom of righteousness, and wept to think that his own death would first remove him from the influence of the future Teacher.[1] The tradition further declared that the Scriptures in which these things were contained had been solemnly rehearsed at a great meeting of the disciples immediately after their Master's death, and had been preserved intact ever since. If a Brahman critic had impeached its truth, should we be surprised if he had declined to accept from Asoka a reply couched in such terms as these?—

'Considering the position which the miraculous Birth holds in the *Dhamma* (the Truth contained in the sacred books), it cannot be denied that the authority of the Buddhist Order is committed to it as a fact beyond recall. To admit that its historical position is really doubtful would be to strike a mortal blow at the authority of the Buddhist Order as a guide to religious truth in any real sense. Such a result is itself an argument against the truth of any position which would tend to produce it.'

IV.

Once more, in another form and with a wider significance, the authority of Christian experience is urged upon us. The inward light, it is pleaded, is the real witness to spiritual truths; and the believer rests securely on personal communion with his heavenly Lord. 'The idea of the living and exalted

[1] See the *Sutta-Nipāta*, in *Sacred Books of the East*, x. p. 125; cp. Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, in *S. B. E.* xi. p. 47; and Mahāpadāna Sutta, in *Digha Nikāya*, ed. Davids and Carpenter, vol. ii. p. 15.

Christ,' we are told, 'is the life-blood of Evangelical Christianity: in all ages of the Church it has been the source of the Church's energy and happiness.'[1] This is the theme of the well-known treatise of the late Dr. Dale, *The Living Christ*, where the ineffable benefits of such fellowship are set forth in the glowing language of impassioned conviction.[2] The records of Christian piety abound in illustrations of this trust, and it is not confined to what is commonly termed 'Evangelical' religion. That such experience marked the devotion of the first days of the Church, the records of the Apostolic age and its successor readily attest. I do not wish rudely to deny the validity of modes of feeling which I do not share: but I ask leave to offer very briefly, in conclusion, some reasons why the doctrine thus begotten may justly be submitted to re-interpretation in the lights of modern thought.

That the language of primitive Christianity is that of enthusiastic emotion is generally recognised; but how many believers of to-day have really passed through any crisis which can be even distantly described as being 'buried' and 'risen' with Christ? The first preachers of the Gospel felt themselves snatched out of a world which lay under the wrath of God, and would shortly be ended by the awful judgment. Into this scene of alienation and gloom a divine ray was shot from heaven. It lighted upon them, and filled their hearts with hope and joy.

[1] Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 408.

[2] See, for instance, p. 10.

They were immediately conscious that great spiritual forces were acting within them; powers from on high surrounded them, worked through them, bore them up; and in their might they could fearlessly encounter danger and death. But in this exaltation the judgment of the intellect was naturally suspended. The vivid sense of heavenly presences swept away distinctions; and the influences which streamed in upon the soul might be referred to different agencies, not because they were themselves intrinsically of diverse kinds, but according as one or other of their sources or channels held for the moment the most prominent place in the swiftly changing movements of thought. The apostle Paul directly identifies the risen Lord with the Spirit; and speaks with equal ease of the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.[1] Are these all separate powers? Surely not; it is the same unseen potency which is conceived in various modes according as it is traced to one Fount of being, or is manifested through some personality once known on earth, or is regarded as the actual quickening energy within the soul. Similarly when 'John' delineates the inner life of the believer, to whom Father and Son may come together to take up their abode with him, does he mean to distinguish this dual advent from that of the Spirit, and, if so, by what marks are these several persons to be recognised?

Moreover, it may be further enquired, how is the Christ discerned in modern Evangelical experience

[1] *Romans* $8^{1\ 9\ 14}$, etc.

to be identified with the historic Jesus of Nazareth? For the first disciples who lived in the same scene, who were separated from the Master by no great length of time, and who looked out upon a world filled with superhuman powers ever engaged in watching, attacking, or defending the soul, there seemed no limit to such possibilities of intercourse. Connexions with the world of the spirit were more easily established; the predispositions for belief were all there; and thought did not pause to consider how the same person could be simultaneously related to believers who, as time went on, were further and further separated in space. The modern student, however, cannot avoid putting this question. He is justly entitled to ask by what means the chasm of distance is to be spanned. But he is frankly told that 'there is no demonstrable connexion between the Jesus of history and the Christ of Christian experience.'[1] Those, then, who cannot make the connexion by an act of faith, will not interpret their experience under this intellectual form. They will not explain their consciousness of an objective spiritual reality by the medium of a person whom they know only, as a person, through the records of the past, and from whose language on some grave themes of human nature and destiny they find serious reason to dissent.

The limitations, indeed, on the human knowledge of Jesus are now freely admitted, though theologians may differ as to their character and extent, or the

[1] Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 416.

inferences to be drawn from them. There is a tendency in consequence to transfer the stress of his significance from the omniscience once ascribed to him, and lay it now upon his sinlessness. Once more candour is ready to confess that this view obviously cannot be based upon historic testimony.[1] You may read a Gospel through in a morning. What record can possibly cover all the experiences of those thirty years? I am not here to charge the Master of Christian souls with sin. But the student who seeks to understand the origins of great doctrines, is bound to test and probe the records of the convictions whence they spring. He notes that in the new joy of deliverance from evil, in the fresh sense of victory over the world, in the divine gladness of birth from above, the disciple, no less than the Teacher, was believed to be exempt from sin;[2] and if experience seems to disprove one assertion, what support is left for faith in the other? There are those, indeed, to whom the doctrine is a hindrance rather than a help. A supernatural sinlessness removes the leader of their religious life out of the sphere of their own moral knowledge.[3] They derive

[1] Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, pp. 371, 396.

[2] See Lect. VII, *ante*, p. 425-6.

[3] Cp. *ante*, Lect. V. p. 245[3] concerning the Temptation of Jesus. A remarkable parallel to this conception is found in the history of the Chinese religion known as Taoism, derived ultimately from the profound speculations of the philosopher designated Lao Tsze, an elder contemporary of Confucius in the sixth century, B.C. Under the influence of Buddhism, the story of Lao Tsze was remodelled, and he was supposed to have appeared repeatedly from prehistoric times down to the age immediately preceding that of Confucius ('Fa Lun King,' cited by Legge, *Religion in China*, p. 236). But another writer, Ko Hung (about 250-330, A.D., Mayers, *Chinese Reader*, p. 87), in his 'history

no help from hearing of the temptation of a Being who could not possibly have fallen; they are not sustained in their own hour of trial by the assurance that the Incarnate Son passed through this world without spot, for what infirmity of earth could cling to the nature born of Heaven?

One great religion, indeed, there is in which a similar doctrine does connect itself with our human experience. In the faith from which I have already drawn so many analogies, the Buddha is presented as without sin. This moral elevation is the immediate result, according to Buddhist ideals, of his supreme wisdom; and this enlightenment was in its turn the issue of an age-long endeavour. The ideal biography of Gotama carried back the secret of his attainment to the hermit Sumedha, who vowed never to abandon the holy quest till he had won the knowledge which would enable him to deliver men and devas from the miseries of perpetual rebirth[1]. To fulfil this vow

of the Gods and Immortals', argued thus: 'If Lao Tsze had been a pure spirit from heaven, it was natural that he should appear in each century, and that he should descend from an honourable rank to take upon himself a lowly condition, that he should quit peace and rest to endure fatigue, that he should renounce purity to expose himself to the defilements of the world, that he should leave a heavenly rule to adopt human functions. . . . In reality he was a sage who possessed the Tao in a higher degree than other men, but he was not different in kind. . . . Some of his followers try to make him pass for a divine and extraordinary being, and to draw future generations to follow him. But by so doing they prevent them from believing that it is possible to acquire by study the secret of immortality. If Lao Tsze is simply a sage who had attained the Tao, men ought to make every effort to follow his example. But if it is affirmed that he is an extraordinary being, endowed with a divine nature, imitation is impossible.' (Julien, *Livre de la Loi et la Vertue*, p. xxiv.-v. 1842. This was in the days of Athanasius and the Council of Nicea.

[1] *Buddhist Birth Stories*, translated by Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids, vol. i. p. 13.

needed, indeed, continuous concentration of endeavour. But if it was pursued unweariedly from life to life through the long cycles of needful discipline, the end was sure. The perfection of a Buddha was an achievement, not a heavenly gift; and this achievement was, in its essential opportunity, open to all. The sinlessness of the Buddha was not the result of a superhuman nature, for he lived and died as man. It was the issue of prolonged moral effort: and whoever would make the effort, might mount to the same height. But this conception underwent in the course of time a very remarkable change. The early doctrine of the Buddha regarded him simply as a man. In that character at death he ceased to be. From the visible scene, the earth and all the graded heavens, he passed away, leaving no trace behind. No worship, therefore, was offered to him. Acts of reverence and commemoration were, indeed, organised. To keep the remembrance of his self-forgetting toil before the mind, was a believer's plain duty. By pilgrimage to the holy places, by hearing recitation of the Teaching, by participation in the festivals which celebrated different aspects of his career, the heart of the true follower was trained to cherish pious affection, and live in devout reverence and aspiration. But the Buddha himself could receive neither prayer nor praise. The contemplation of his example might beget a kind of exulting joy. No disciple, however, supposed that the Teacher was conscious of his faith, or looked with sympathy upon his struggles, or sustained him personally as he

sages and the sacred writ, that wherever the true follower has walked or sat, reciting even one holy verse, that spot of earth has been enjoyed by myself, there have I walked myself, and there have I been sitting. Where that son of Buddha has stayed, there I am.[1] Buddhism, therefore, which started with the maxim 'Work out your own deliverance with diligence,'[2] might afterwards have added, 'for it is the Buddha which worketh in you to will and to work.' When the Brahman Rámachandra was converted to Buddhism in the eleventh century, he seems to have been driven by persecution from his native land in the Ganges valley, and to have found shelter in Ceylon. There he poured out his trust in a little garland of verse, which almost resembles the language of Christian mysticism[3]:

'Whether I live in heaven or in hell, whether in the city of ghosts or of men, let my mind remain fixed on thee, for there is no other happiness for me. Thou art my father, mother, brother, sister; thou art my fast friend in danger, O dear one, thou art my lord, my teacher who imparts to me knowledge sweet as nectar. Thou art my wealth, my enjoyment, my knowledge, my affluence, my greatness, my reputation, my knowledge, and my life. Thou art my all, O all-knowing Buddha!'

Is this the language of illusion or fancy, while the utterances of Christendom alone are real? Is the genuineness of a religious development to be measured by its place upon the map; or shall we

[1] *S. B. E.* xxi. p. 327.

[2] Buddhist Suttas, *S. B. E.* xi. p. 174.

[3] *Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Feb. 1890, p. 125.

refuse to listen to any voice that does not speak in our sacred Name? If the appeal is made to experience, it cannot be limited to the records of one colour, climate, or creed; and we must find place for an eternal Buddha as well as for an everlasting Christ.[1]

Neither then in the shape of a sacred book or a sacred tradition, on the one hand, nor in the emphatic delineation of the phases of the soul's inner life, upon the other, can the authority of the Church be said to guarantee itself. The attestation of external fact may be impugned; the evidence may be imperfect; the alleged occurrence may be beyond the reach of proof. It may even be possible to produce the factors which have generated the idea, and show why the belief should have assumed that form. The testimony of sentiment or emotion is less easily set aside. Such inward witness carries with it a conviction of finality or assurance, which we cannot bear to see assailed. There is so intimate a relation between these cherished faiths and the very centre of our personality, that we are wounded and outraged at the cold attempts of criticism:

> 'And like a man in wrath, the heart
> Stands up and answers, I have felt.'

Yet in all such cases there are really two elements, and till we can keep them in our minds clearly apart, there is always risk of confusion and error. In the first place comes the inward feeling.

[1] See the ritual translated by Beal, *Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese*, pp. 399-409.

This is the primary constituent of our experience. The intellectual interpretation which follows is of a secondary character.[1] It is not in itself immediate; it is first of all impressed upon us by those under whose guidance the feeling has been roused; it is associated in our minds with all that we most cherish and revere in our teachers; or perhaps it has been hallowed by some solemn hour of incommunicable emotion when we were alone with the mysterious Power to which we had learnt to give the name of Christ. And yet as we look back upon it, we find it again and again subject to correction, or at least to re-interpretation. We observe that similar emotions tend to cluster round different historic forms. The Catholic who receives upon his lips in the consecrated wafer the very body of his Lord, believes himself conscious of a personal relation to Christ, a vital quickening through sacramental grace, the very foundation of which the Evangelical denies. No one can read the higher literature of Eucharistic devotion, or see the effects of it—I will not say in the lives of some of his own

[1] This may be illustrated from another point of view by the changed interpretation of the phenomena of evil. The rise of malicious thoughts, storms of ill-regulated passion, gusts of anger, tempests of hate, and the like, used to be ascribed to the presence of emissaries of the Evil One. In the sixteenth century Luther wrestled with a personal Satan. In the eighteenth Wesley prayed over those who were possessed with devils. In the intervening generations how many unfortunate sufferers were supposed to be under diabolic control, and could even minutely describe their own symptoms. In this case a larger experience has corrected a narrower. New knowledge has suggested new interpretations. And as the old belief died away, the violence of the emotion engendered under it has in its turn declined, and the disturbances and agitations trouble us no more.

friends, but upon some historic scale, such as in the records of Port Royal,—without sympathy and admiration for the exalted types of character so often associated with a belief in the continuous repetition of a stupendous miracle which others regard as a gigantic illusion. Will the Evangelical deny the validity of this communion? Then by what process can he justify his own? If he asserts the claims of the priest to be rooted in error, and the miracle of transubstantiation to be no reality at all, only the fatal outcome of ages of superstition, what reply can he make to those who challenge the interpretation which he places on the phases of his own inner life, and assert that a similar help flows in on them, not through the medium of a personality once known in history, but from the eternal source of all truth and good?

We are, in fact, only at the threshold of vast prospects over a wider field of religious experience than have ever been possible before. We see that in many ages and by many modes the soul went forth to a Power beyond itself, before it had learned to recognise that the same Power was already within. In the first ages of Christianity that Power was again and again identified with a great historic manifestation in the person of Christ. There are minds for which many of the reasons which seemed to justify that identification then, have now lost their force. Must they, therefore, deny the validity of the experience? Assuredly not, but they may reject the explanation. They may point out that

similar results are achieved elsewhere by other means and through different forms. They may urge that a theology which is founded on the inner life of the soul, cannot limit itself to one specific line of development; still less can it mark out within Christianity itself a seed plot of truth, and declare the blossoms in other gardens only the rank growths of a lie. They may plead that the Power which energises in myriad ways to sustain and cheer, to redeem and bless, must itself be universal: and as they give to it the dear names of Maker, Father, Redeemer, Comforter, in the 'diversities of workings' they will recognise with wonder and awe 'the same God, who worketh all things in all.'[1]

We may be prepared, therefore, without alarm for gradual changes in the forms of our religious thought. They will tend in the direction of greater simplicity. We shall be more willing to recognise with sympathy elements of value in ideas and emotions which we do not share; and we shall cease to insist that the experience of others shall be moulded after our particular type. The Nineteenth Century has discovered meanings in the Bible which had never been realised before. It has found the clues to its origin; it has traced the development of its great conceptions of God and man; it has drawn out the beginnings of the far-reaching faith in the

[1] To this conclusion, to which the history of religion seems to me to point, we are also led along the path of psychology by such a book as *The Varieties of Religious Experience* by Prof. William James. The belief that the soul can have direct contact with an objective spiritual reality is there vindicated after a comparison of different phases of the inner life.

unity of purpose pervading the mysterious courses of the world. But in insisting that the Bible must be interpreted in the light of historical imagination, modern study has not made it an easy book for the casual reader. It sometimes requires us to realise antique forms of belief from which the thought of to-day has moved far away; it carries us among distant peoples who interpreted life in terms often widely different from ours. Much of it, moreover, presupposes an elevation and an intensity of spirit which we are only able truly to approach in rare moments of clearness and trust. Behind its familiar language lie conceptions and appeals to which we cannot respond without efforts of sympathy and aspiration. To read the Bible aright is to rise to its standards, and appropriate its truths. But this involves more than its mere literary appreciation. Its understanding demands of us a certain strenuousness of apprehension; we are called to serious endeavours if we would reach its lofty altitudes of faith. For its great sayings enshrine the highest attainments of human insight, when the veils that hinder our vision have been for a season withdrawn. They have stood the test of centuries and remain undimmed. They have behind them the 'weight of ages' through which they have sustained the life of the dim common populations, and nurtured the forces of duty and piety on which the advance of our best efforts depends. Among the religious autobiographies of our race the Bible occupies, indeed, no place apart. The Scriptures